arXiv:1611.07440v1 [math.PR] 22 Nov 2016

Spectral properties of polynomials in independent Wigner and deterministic matrices

S. Belinschi*and M. Capitaine†

Abstract

On the one hand, we prove that almost surely, for large dimension, there is no eigenvalue of a Hermitian polynomial in independent Wigner and deterministic matrices, in any interval lying at some distance from the supports of a sequence of deterministic probability measures, which is computed with the tools of free probability. On the other hand, we establish the strong asymptotic freeness of independent Wigner matrices and any family of deterministic matrices with strong limiting distribution.

1 Introduction

Free probability theory was introduced by Voiculescu around 1983 motivated by the isomorphism problem of von Neumann algebras of free groups. He developped a noncommutative probability theory, on a noncommutative probability space, in which a new notion of freeness plays the role of independence in classical probability. Around 1991, Voiculescu [34] threw a bridge connecting random matrix theory with free probability since he realized that the freeness property is also present for many classes of random matrices, in the asymptotic regime when the size of the matrices tends to infinity. Since then, random matrices have played a key role in operator algebra whereas tools developed in operator algebras and free probability theory could now be applied to random matrix problems.
For the reader's convenience, we recall the following basic definitions from free probability theory. For a thorough introduction to free probability theory, we refer to [39].

*CNRS, Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, F-31062 Toulouse Cedex 09. E-mail: serban.belinschi@math.univ-toulouse.fr

†CNRS, Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, F-31062 Toulouse Cedex 09. E-mail: mireille.capitaine@math.univ-toulouse.fr

- A $\mathcal{C}^*$-probability space is a pair $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ consisting of a unital $\mathcal{C}^*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ and a state τ on $\mathcal{A}$ i.e a linear map $\tau : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $\tau(1_{\mathcal{A}}) = 1$ and $\tau(aa^*) \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. τ is a trace if it satisfies $\tau(ab) = \tau(ba)$ for every $(a, b) \in \mathcal{A}^2$. A trace is said to be faithful if $\tau(aa^*) > 0$ whenever $a \neq 0$. An element of $\mathcal{A}$ is called a noncommutative random variable.

- The noncommutative distribution of a family $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ of noncommutative random variables in a $\mathcal{C}^*$-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ is defined as the linear functional $\mu_a : P \mapsto \tau(P(a, a^*))$ defined on the set of polynomials in $2k$ noncommutative indeterminates, where (a, a^*) denotes the $2k$-uple $(a_1, \ldots, a_k, a_1^*, \ldots, a_k^*)$. For any self-adjoint element a_1 in $\mathcal{A}$, there exists a probability measure ν_{a_1} on $\mathbb{R}$ such that, for every polynomial P, we have

$$\mu_{a_1}(P) = \int P(t) \mathrm{d}\nu_{a_1}(t).$$

  Then, we identify μ_{a_1} and ν_{a_1}. If τ is faithful then the support of ν_{a_1} is the spectrum of a_1 and thus $\|a_1\| = \sup\{|z|, z \in \mathrm{support}(\nu_{\mathrm{a_1}})\}$.

- A family of elements $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ in a $\mathcal{C}^*$-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ is free if for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all polynomials $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ in two noncommutative indeterminates, one has

$$\tau(p_1(a_{i_1}, a_{i_1}^*) \cdots p_k(a_{i_k}, a_{i_k}^*)) = 0 \tag{1.1}$$

  whenever $i_1 \neq i_2, i_2 \neq i_3, \ldots, i_{n-1} \neq i_k$ and $\tau(p_l(a_{i_l}, a_{i_l}^*)) = 0$ for $l = 1, \ldots, k$.

- A family $(x_i)_{i \in I}$ of element in a $\mathcal{C}^*$-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ is a semicircular family if $x_i = x_i^*$ for all $i \in I$, $(x_i)_{i \in I}$ is a free family and for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\tau(x_i^k) = \int t^k d\mu_{sc}(t)$$

  where $d\mu_{sc}(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{4 - t^2}\mathbf{1}_{[-2;2]}(t)dt$ is the semicircular standard distribution.

- Let k be a nonnull integer number. Denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the set of polynomials in $2k$ noncommutative indeterminates. A sequence of families of variables $(a_n)_{n \geq 1} = (a_1(n), \ldots, a_k(n))_{n \geq 1}$ in C^*-probability spaces $(\mathcal{A}_n, \tau_n)$ converge, when n goes to infinity, respectively in distribution if the map $P \in \mathcal{P} \mapsto \tau_n(P(a_n, a_n^*))$ converges pointwise and strongly in distribution if moreover the map $P \in \mathcal{P} \mapsto \|P(a_n, a_n^*)\|$ converges pointwise.

Voiculescu considered random matrices in this noncommutative probability context. Let $\mathcal{A}_n$ be the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices whose entries are random variables with finite moments and endow this algebra with the expectation of the normalized trace defined for any $M \in \mathcal{A}_n$ by $\tau_n(M) = \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Tr}(M)]$. Let us consider r independent $n \times n$ so-called G.U.E matrices, i.e random Hermitian matrices $X_n^{(v)} = [X_{jk}^{(v)}]_{j,k=1}^n$, $v = 1, \ldots, r$, for which the random variables $(X_{ii}^{(v)})$, $(\sqrt{2}Re(X_{ij}^{(v)})_{i<j}$, $(\sqrt{2}Im(X_{ij}^{(v)})_{i<j}$ are independent centered gaussian distribution with variance 1. Voiculescu discovered that these independent G.U.E matrices are asymptotically free and provide a model for a free semi-circular system since he established that for any polynomial P in r noncommutative indeterminates,

$$\tau_n \left\{ P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right\} \to_{n\to+\infty} \tau\left(P(x_1, \ldots, x_r)\right) \tag{1.2}$$

where $(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ is a semicircular system in some $\mathcal{C}^*$-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$. It turns out that this result still holds on the one hand almost surely dealing with the normalized trace $\tau_n(M) = \frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Tr}(M)$ instead of the mean normalized trace [32] and on the other hand for non-gaussian Wigner matrices [18] or many other classical matricial models (see Chapter 4 in [22]).

In [20], Haagerup and Thorbjørsen proved the strong asymptotic freeness of independent G.U.E matrices, namely: almost surely, for any polynomial P in r noncommutative indeterminates,

$$\left\| P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right\| \to_{n\to+\infty} \|P(x_1, \ldots, x_r)\|. \tag{1.3}$$

Note that this result led to the proof of the very important result in the theory of operator algebras that $Ext(\mathcal{C}^*_{red}(F_2))$ is not a group. (1.3) was proved for Gaussian random matrices with real or symplectic entries by Schultz [29], for Wigner matrices with symmetric distribution of the entries satisfying a Poincaré inequality by Capitaine and Donati-Martin [14] and for Wigner matrices under i.i.d assumptions and fourth moment hypotheses by Anderson [2].

The first result (1.2) of Voiculescu is actually more general since Voiculescu proved the asymptotic freeness of independent G.U.E matrices with an extra family of deterministic diagonal matrices with limiting distribution. Male [25] established the corresponding strong convergence. Note that in [16],

Collins and Male established the strong asymptotic freeness of Haar and deterministic matrices with strong limiting distribution.
In this paper, on the one hand, we prove the strong asymptotic freeness of independent non-Gaussian Wigner matrices and an extra family of deterministic matrices with strong limiting distribution (see Theorem 1.2).

On the other hand we prove that a sequence of deterministic measures plays a central role in the study of the spectrum of a Hermitian polynomial in independent Wigner matrices and deterministic matrices. Roughly speaking, these measures are in some sense obtained by taking partially the limit when n goes to infinity, only for the Wigner matrices. We establish that almost surely, for large n, each interval lying at some distance from the supports of these deterministic measures contains no eigenvalue of the Hermitian polynomial (see Theorem 1.1). This type of result was first established by Bai and Silverstein in [6] for sample covariance matrices and in [8] for Information-plus-noise type models, and by Capitaine, Donati-Martin, Féral and Février in [15] for additive deformations of a Wigner matrix.

Here are the matricial models we deal with. Let t and r be fixed nonull integer numbers independent from n.

• $(A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)})$ is a $t-$tuple of $n \times n$ deterministic matrices such that for any $u = 1, \ldots, t$,

$$\sup_n \|A_n^{(u)}\| < \infty, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the spectral norm.

• We consider r independent $n \times n$ random Hermitian matrices $X_n^{(v)} = [X_{ij}^{(v)}]_{i,j=1}^n$, $v = 1, \ldots, r$, where, for each v, $[X_{ij}^{(v)}]_{i \geq 1, j \geq 1}$ is an infinite array of random variables such that $X_{ii}^{(v)}$, $\sqrt{2}Re(X_{ij}^{(v)}), i < j$, $\sqrt{2}Im(X_{ij}^{(v)}), i < j$, are independent, centered with variance 1 and satisfy:

1. There exists a K_v and a random variable $Z^{(v)}$ with finite fourth moment for which there exists $x_0 > 0$ and an integer number $n_0 > 0$ such that, for any $x > x_0$ and any integer number $n > n_0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} P\left(|X_{ij}^{(v)}| > x\right) \leq K_v P\left(|Z^{(v)}| > x\right). \tag{1.5}$$

2.

$$\sup_{(i<j) \in \mathbb{N}^2} \mathbb{E}(|X_{ij}^{(v)}|^3) < +\infty.$$

Remark 1. *Note that assumption such as* (1.5) *appears in [17]. It obviously holds if the* $X_{ii}^{(v)}$, $\sqrt{2}Re(X_{ij}^{(v)}), i<j$, $\sqrt{2}Im(X_{ij}^{(v)}), i<j$, *are identically distributed with finite fourth moment.*

Here are our main results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ *be a* C^**-probability space equipped with a faithful tracial state and* $x=(x_1,\ldots,x_r)$ *be a semi-circular system in* $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$. *Let* $a_n=(a_n^{(1)},\ldots,a_n^{(t)})$ *be a t-tuple of noncommutative random variables which is free from* x *in* $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ *and such that the distribution of* a_n *in* $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ *coincides with the distribution of* $(A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)})$ *in* $(M_n(\mathbb{C}),\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Tr})$. *Let* P *be a Hermitian polynomial in 2t+r noncommutative indeterminates. Let* $[b,c]$ *be a real interval such that there exists* $\delta>0$ *such that, for any large* n, $[b-\delta,c+\delta]$ *lies outside the support of the distribution of the noncommutative random variable* $P\left(x_1,\ldots,x_r,a_n^{(1)},\ldots,a_n^{(t)},(a_n^{(1)})^*,\ldots,(a_n^{(t)})^*\right)$ *in* $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$. *Then, almost surely, for all large* n, *there is no eigenvalue of the* $n\times n$ *matrix* $P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}},\ldots,\frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}},A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)},(A_n^{(1)})^*,\ldots,(A_n^{(t)})^*\right)$ *in* $[b,c]$.

Remark 2. *When* $A_n^{(1)}=(A_n^{(1)})^*$ *and* $P(X,Y)=X+Y$, *the distribution of* $P(x_1,a_n^{(1)})$ *is the so-called free convolution* $\mu_{sc}\boxplus\mu_{A_n^{(1)}}$ *where* $\mu_{A_n^{(1)}}=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\lambda_i(A_n^{(1)})$, *denoting by* $\lambda_i(A_n^{(1)})$, $i=1,\ldots,n$, *the eigenvalues of* $A_n^{(1)}$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let* $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$ *be a* C^**-probability space equipped with a faithful tracial state. Let* $x=(x_1,\ldots,x_r)$ *be a semi-circular system and* $a=(a_1,\ldots,a_t)$ *be a t-tuple of noncommutative random variables which is free from* x *in* $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$.
Assume moreover that $(A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)},(A_n^{(1)})^*,\ldots,(A_n^{(t)})^*)$ *converges strongly towards* $a=(a_1,\ldots,a_t,a_1^*,\ldots,a_t^*)$ *in* $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$, *that is for any polynomial* P *in 2t noncommutative indeterminates,*

$$\frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Tr}P\left(A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)},(A_n^{(1)})^*,\ldots,(A_n^{(t)})^*\right)$$
$$\to_{n\to+\infty}\tau\left(P(a_1,\ldots,a_t,a_1^*,\ldots,a_t^*)\right.$$

and

$$\left\|P\left(A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)},(A_n^{(1)})^*,\ldots,(A_n^{(t)})^*\right)\right\|$$
$$\to_{n\to+\infty}\left\|P(a_1,\ldots,a_t,a_1^*,\ldots,a_t^*)\right\|_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Then, almost surely, for any polynomial P in $r+2t$ noncommutative variables,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{Tr} P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}}, A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)}, (A_n^{(1)})^*, \ldots, (A_n^{(t)})^*\right)$$
$$= \tau\left(P\left(x_1, \ldots, x_r, a_1, \ldots, a_t, a_1^*, \ldots, a_t^*\right)\right) \tag{1.6}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \left\| P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}}, A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)}, (A_n^{(1)})^*, \ldots, (A_n^{(t)})^*\right)\right\|$$
$$= \left\|P\left(x_1, \ldots, x_r, a_1, \ldots, a_t, a_1^*, \ldots, a_t^*\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{1.7}$$

Note that it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 for Hermitian matrices $A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)}$ by considering their Hermitian and anti-Hermitian parts, so that throughout the paper we assume that the $A_n^{(i)}$'s are Hermitian.

We adopt the strategy from [20] and [29] based on a linearization trick and sharp estimates on matricial Stieltjes transforms. More precisely, both proofs of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.1 are based on the following key lemma 1.3. First, note that the algebra $M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}$ formed by the $m \times m$ matrices with coefficients in $\mathcal{A}$, inherits the structure of $\mathcal{C}^*$-probability space with trace $\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{Tr}_m \otimes \tau$ and norm

$$\|b\| = \lim_{k\to+\infty} \left(\frac{1}{m} \operatorname{Tr}_m \otimes \tau\left[(b^*b)^k\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{2k}}, \ \forall b \in M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}.$$

Lemma 1.3. *Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ be a C^*-probability space equipped with a faithful tracial state and $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ be a semi-circular system in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$. Let $a_n = (a_n^{(1)}, \ldots, a_n^{(t)})$ be a t-tuple of noncommutative self-adjoint random variables which is free from x in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$, such that the distribution of a_n coincides with the distribution of $(A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)})$ in $(M_n(\mathbb{C}), \frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Tr}_n)$. Then, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, all self-adjoint matrices $\gamma, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_t$ of size $m \times m$ and all $\epsilon > 0$, almost surely, for all large n, we have*

$$sp(\gamma \otimes I_n + \textstyle\sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v \otimes \frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}} + \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)})$$
$$\subset sp(\gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}) +]-\epsilon, \epsilon[. \tag{1.8}$$

Here, $sp(T)$ denotes the spectrum of the operator T, I_n the identity matrix and $1_{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes the unit of $\mathcal{A}$.

Remark 3. *By a density argument, it is sufficient to prove Lemma 1.3 for invertible self-adjoint matrices $\gamma, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_t$.*

The proof of (1.8) requires sharp estimates of $g_n(z) - \tilde{g}_n(z)$ where for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$,

$$g_n(z) = \mathbb{E}\frac{1}{m}\operatorname{Tr}_m \otimes \frac{1}{n}\operatorname{Tr}_n[(zI_m \otimes I_n - \gamma \otimes I_n - \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes \frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}(\omega) - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)})^{-1}]$$

and

$$\tilde{g}_n(z) = \frac{1}{m}\operatorname{Tr}_m \otimes \tau[(zI_m \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)})^{-1}].$$

More precisely we are going to establish that there exists a polynomial Q with nonnegative coefficients such that, for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$,

$$\left| g_n(z) - \tilde{g}_n(z) + \tilde{E}_n(z) \right| \leq \frac{Q(|\Im m z|^{-1})}{n\sqrt{n}}, \tag{1.9}$$

where $\tilde{E}_n$ is the Stieltjes transform of a compactly supported distribution ∇_n on $\mathbb{R}$ whose support is included in the spectrum of $\gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}$ and such that $\nabla_n(1) = 0$.
But this required sharp estimate makes necessary a technical piece of work and a fit use of free operator-valued subordination maps (see Section 4). In particular, we need an explicit development of the Stieltjes transform up to the order $\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}$ but the stability under perturbation argument used in [25] does not provide this development from the approximate matricial subordination equation. Therefore we use a strategy based on an invertibility property of matricial subordination maps related to semi-circular system (see Lemma 5.8).

Theorem 1.2 can be deduced from Lemma 1.3 by following the proofs in [20] and [29]. Given a noncommutative polynomial P, choosing in Lemma 1.3 the γ, $(\alpha_v)_{v=1,\ldots,r}$, $(\beta_u)_{u=1,\ldots,t}$ corresponding to a self-adjoint linearization of P as defined in [2] allows to deduce Theorem 1.1.

In Section 2, we explain why, using a truncation and Gaussian convolution procedure, it is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.1 when we assume that the $X_{ij}^{(v)}$'s satisfy:

(H1) the variables $\sqrt{2}\Re e X_{ij}^{(v)}$, $\sqrt{2}\Im m X_{ij}^{(v)}$, $(i<j)\in\mathbb{N}^2$, $X_{ii}^{(v)}$, $i\in\mathbb{N}$, $v=1,\dots,r$, are independent, centered with variance 1 and satisfy a Poincaré inequality with common constant C_{PI}.

(H2) For any $p\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\max_{v=1,\dots,r}\sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2}\mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij}^{(v)}|^p\right)<+\infty. \tag{1.10}$$

We also explain how the proof of Theorem 1.2 may be reduced to prove that for any polynomial P in $r+t$ noncommutative variables, almost surely,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\left\|P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}},\dots,\frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}},A_n^{(1)},\dots,A_n^{(t)}\right)\right\|=\left\|P\left(x_1,\dots,x_r,a_1,\dots,a_t\right)\right\|_{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{1.11}$$

In Section 3, we introduce numerous notations and objects that will be used in the proofs. Section 4 provides required preliminaries on free operator-valued subordination properties. The main section is Section 5 where we establish Lemma 1.3. In Sections 6 and 7, we show how to deduce Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 respectively from Lemma 1.3. We end with an Appendix which gathers several useful basic algebraic lemmas and variance estimates.

2 Truncation and Gaussian convolution

We start with a slightly modified version of Bai-Yin's theorem (see [9] for the symmetric case and Theorem 5.1 in [7] for the Hermitian case).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $Z_n=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}[Z_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^n$ be a Hermitian $n\times n$ matrix such that $(Z_{ij})_{i\le j}$, are independent, centered random variables such that*

$$\sup_{(i<j)\in\mathbb{N}^2}\mathbb{E}(|Z_{ij}|^3)<+\infty$$

and there exists a real number $K>0$ and a nonnegative random variable Y with finite fourth moment for which there exists $x_0>0$ and an integer number $n_0>0$ such that, for any $x>x_0$ and any integer number $n>n_0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{1\le i\le n,1\le j\le n}P\left(|Z_{ij}|>x\right)\le KP\left(Y>x\right). \tag{2.1}$$

Then, setting $\sigma^* = \{\sup_{(i<j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} \mathbb{E}(|Z_{ij}|^2)\}^{1/2}$, *we have that almost surely*

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \left\| \frac{Z_n}{\sqrt{n}} \right\| \leq 2\sigma^*.$$

Proof. Noting that, for any nonnegative increasing sequence $(u_l)_{l\geq 1}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left(\frac{Y}{\sigma^*}\right)^4\right) = 4\int_0^{+\infty} t^3 \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Y}{\sigma^*} > t\right) dt \geq \sum_{l=1}^{+\infty} u_l^3 (u_{l+1} - u_l) \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Y}{\sigma^*} > u_{l+1}\right),$$

it readily follows that for any $\delta > 0$, choosing $u_l = \delta 2^{(l-1)/2}$, we have

$$\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} 2^{2l} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Y}{\sigma^*} > \delta 2^{l/2}\right) < \infty.$$

In particular, there exists an increasing sequence $(N_k)_{k\geq 1}$ of integer numbers such that for any $k \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{l=N_k+1}^{\infty} 2^{2l} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Y}{\sigma^*} > \frac{1}{2^{\frac{k}{8}}} 2^{l/2}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2^k}.$$

Set for any $l \in]0, N_1]$, $\epsilon_l = 1$ and for any $l \in]N_k, N_{k+1}]$, $\epsilon_l = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{k}{8}}}$. Then,

$$\sum_{l=N_1+1}^{\infty} 2^{2l} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Y}{\sigma^*} > \epsilon_l 2^{l/2}\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \sum_{l=N_k+1}^{N_{k+1}} 2^{2l} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Y}{\sigma^*} > \frac{1}{2^{\frac{k}{8}}} 2^{l/2}\right) \leq \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^k} < \infty.$$

Define $\delta_n = \sqrt{2}\epsilon_l$ for $2^{l-1} < n \leq 2^l$. Thus, we exhibited a sequence of nonnegative numbers such that $\delta_n \downarrow 0$, $\delta_n^2 \sqrt{n} \to +\infty$ and

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{2n} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Y}{\sigma^*} > \delta_{2^n} 2^{(n-1)/2}\right) < \infty.$$

Let us consider $X = Z_n/\sigma^*$. Define for any $(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $\check{X}_{ij} = X_{ij} \mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}| \leq \sqrt{n}\delta_n}$.

We have for any k large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(X \neq \check{X}\ i.o\right) &\leq \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{2^{l-1}<n\leq 2^l} \bigcup_{1\leq i,j\leq n} \left\{|X_{ij}| > \sqrt{n}\delta_n\right\}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{2^{l-1}<n\leq 2^l} \bigcup_{1\leq i,j\leq n} \left\{|X_{ij}| > 2^{\frac{l-1}{2}}\delta_{2^l}\right\}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{l=k}^{\infty} \sum_{1\leq i,j\leq 2^l} \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{ij}| > 2^{\frac{l-1}{2}}\delta_{2^l}\right) \\
&\leq K\sum_{l=k}^{\infty} 2^{2l}\mathbb{P}\left(Y > 2^{\frac{l-1}{2}}\delta_{2^l}\sigma^*\right) \to_{k\to+\infty} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Define for $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i,j \leq n$, $\hat{X}_{ij} = X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|\leq\sqrt{n}\delta_n}$ and for any i, $\hat{X}_{ii} = 0$. Then, we have $\left\|\frac{\check{X}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\hat{X}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\| \leq \delta_n \to_{n\to+\infty} 0$. Finally define for $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i,j \leq n$, $\tilde{X}_{ij} = X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|\leq\sqrt{n}\delta_n} - \mathbb{E}\left(X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|\leq\sqrt{n}\delta_n}\right)$ and for any i, $\tilde{X}_{ii} = 0$. We have for large n (denoting by $\|\cdot\|_2$ the Hilbert-Schmidt norm)

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\frac{\hat{X}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{X}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\| &\leq \left\|\frac{\hat{X}}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{X}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\|_2 \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i,j=1;i\neq j}^{n} \left|\mathbb{E}\left(X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>\sqrt{n}\delta_n}\right)\right|^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{n^3\delta_n^4}\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij}^2|\right)\mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij}|^4\,\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>\sqrt{n}\delta_n}\right)\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{K}{n\delta_n^4}\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\frac{Y}{\sigma^*}\right|^4\mathbf{1}_{|\frac{Y}{\sigma^*}|>\sqrt{n}\delta_n}\right)\right)^{1/2} \to_{n\to+\infty} 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have that almost surely

$$\left\|\frac{X}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{X}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\| \to_{n\to+\infty} 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Note that the entries of $\tilde{X}$ satisfy

- $\tilde{X}_{ii} = 0$;

- $\mathbb{E}\left(\tilde{X}_{ij}\right) = 0, \mathbb{E}\left(|\tilde{X}_{ij}|^2\right) \leq 1, \quad \text{for} \quad i \neq j;$
- $|\tilde{X}_{ij}| \leq 2\delta_n\sqrt{n}, \quad \text{for} \quad i \neq j;$
- $\mathbb{E}\left(|\tilde{X}_{ij}|^l\right) \leq b\,(2\delta_n\sqrt{n})^{l-3}$, for some constant $b > 0$ and all $i \neq j,\ l \geq 3$.

Then, sticking to the end of the proof of Theorem 5.1 pages 87-93 in [7], one can prove that for any even integer k, one have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(Tr\left(\frac{\tilde{X}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^k\right) \leq n^2\left[2 + (10(2\delta_n)^{1/3}k/\log n)^3\right]^k.$$

Chebychev's inequality yields that for any $\eta > 2$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{\tilde{X}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\| > \eta\right) \leq \frac{1}{\eta^k}\mathbb{E}\left(Tr\left(\frac{\tilde{X}}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^k\right) \leq n^2\left[\frac{2}{\eta} + \frac{(10(2\delta_n)^{1/3}k/\log n)^3}{\eta}\right]^k. \tag{2.3}$$

Selecting the sequence of even integers $k_n = 2\left\lfloor \frac{\log n}{\delta_n^{1/6}} \right\rfloor$ with the properties $k_n/\log n \to +\infty$ and $k_n\delta_n^{1/3}/\log n \to 0$, we obtain that the right hand side of (2.3) is summable. Using Borel-Cantelli's Lemma, we easily deduce that almost surely

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\left\|\frac{\tilde{X}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\| \leq 2$$

and then, using (2.2), that almost surely

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\left\|\frac{X}{\sqrt{n}}\right\| \leq 2.$$

□

According to Lemma 2.1, for any $v = 1, \ldots, r$, almost surely, $\sup_n \|X_n^{(v)}\| < +\infty$. Therefore by a simple approximation argument using polynomials with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q} + i\mathbb{Q}$, to establish Theorem 1.2, it is sufficient to prove that for any polynomial, almost surely (1.6) and (1.7) hold. Now, we are going to show that the proof of Theorem 1.2 can be reduced to the proof of (1.7) in the case where the $X_{ij}^{(v)}$'s satisfy $(H1)$ and $(H2)$.

Let $X = [X_{jk}]_{j,k=1}^n$ be a Hermitian $n \times n$ matrix such that the random variables X_{ii}, $\sqrt{2}\Re e(X_{ij})$, $\sqrt{2}\Im m(X_{ij}), i < j$, are independent, centered with variance 1 such that

$$\theta^* = \sup_{(i<j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} \mathbb{E}(|X_{ij}|^3) < +\infty,$$

and there exists a K and a random variable Z with finite fourth moment for which there exists $x_0 > 0$ and an integer number $n_0 > 0$ such that, for any $x > x_0$ and any integer number $n > n_0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i\leq n, j\leq n} P\left(|X_{ij}| > x\right) \leq KP\left(|Z| > x\right). \tag{2.4}$$

Define for any $C > 0$, for any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$,

$$Y_{ij}^C = X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|\leq C} - \mathbb{E}\left(X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|\leq C}\right).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij} - Y_{ij}^C|^2\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij}|^2\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>C}\right) \\ &\quad - \left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\Re e X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>C}\right)\right\}^2 - \left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\Im m X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>C}\right)\right\}^2\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} \mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij} - Y_{ij}^C|^2\right) \leq \frac{\theta^*}{C}.$$

According to Lemma 2.1, we have almost surely

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \|\frac{X}{\sqrt{n}} - \frac{Y^C}{\sqrt{n}}\| \leq 2\frac{\sqrt{\theta^*}}{\sqrt{C}}. \tag{2.5}$$

Now define

$$X_{ij}^C = \frac{Y_{ij}^C}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{ij}^C|^2\right)}}.$$

Note that

$$X_{ij}^C - Y_{ij}^C = X_{ij}^C \frac{1 - \mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{ij}^C|^2\right)}{1 + \mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{ij}^C|^2\right)^{1/2}},$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} 1-\mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{ij}^C|^2\right) &= \mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij}|^2\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>C}\right)+\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\Re e X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>C}\right)\right\}^2 \\ &\quad +\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\Im m X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>C}\right)\right\}^2 \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}\left(|X_{ij}\mathbf{1}_{|X_{ij}|>C}|^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2}|1-\mathbb{E}\left(|Y_{ij}^C|^2\right)|\leq\frac{2\theta^*}{C}.$$

Let us assume that $C>4\theta^*$. According to Lemma 2.1, we have almost surely

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\|\frac{X^C}{\sqrt{n}}-\frac{Y^C}{\sqrt{n}}\|\leq\frac{4\theta^*}{C}. \tag{2.6}$$

Thus, by (2.5) and (2.6), we obtain that almost surely

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\|\frac{X}{\sqrt{n}}-\frac{X^C}{\sqrt{n}}\|\leq 2\frac{\sqrt{\theta^*}}{\sqrt{C}}+\frac{4\theta^*}{C}. \tag{2.7}$$

Let $(\mathcal{G}_{ij})$ be an infinite array which is independent of the $X_{ij}'s$ and such that $\sqrt{2}\Re e\mathcal{G}_{ij}$, $\sqrt{2}\Im m\mathcal{G}_{ij}$, $i<j$, and $\mathcal{G}_{ii}$ are independent centred standard real gaussian variables. Thus, $\mathcal{G}=(\mathcal{G})_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$ is a random G.U.E matrix being independent of X. Define for any $\delta>0$,

$$X^{C,\delta}=\frac{X^C+\delta\mathcal{G}}{\sqrt{1+\delta^2}}.$$

Note that the random variables $\sqrt{2}\Re e(X^{(v)})_{ij}^{C,\delta}$, $\sqrt{2}\Im m(X^{(v)})_{ij}^{C,\delta}$, $i<j$, $(X^{(v)})_{ii}^{C,\delta}$ are independent, centered with variance 1.
From Bai-Yin's theorem (Theorem 5.8 in [7]), we have that almost surely,

$$\left\|\frac{\mathcal{G}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\|=2+o(1) \tag{2.8}$$

and by Lemma 2.1, for any $C>4\theta^*$, we have almost surely

$$\left\|\frac{X^C}{\sqrt{n}}\right\|\leq 2. \tag{2.9}$$

Now, (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9) yield that for any $C>4\theta^*$, any $\delta>0$, almost surely $\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\left\|\frac{X-X^{C,\delta}}{\sqrt{n}}\right\|\leq u_C+v_\delta$ where u_C and v_δ are deterministic

positive functions tending to zero when respectively C goes to infinity and δ goes to zero. Hence, it is easy to see that for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists C_ϵ and δ_ϵ such that almost surely for all large n,

$$\left\| \frac{X - X^{C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon}}{\sqrt{n}} \right\| \leq \epsilon.$$

We can deduce that for any polynomial P in $r + t$ noncommutative variables, there exists some constant $L > 0$ such that the following holds: for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists C_ϵ and δ_ϵ such that almost surely for all large n,

$$\left\| P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}}, A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)}\right) \right.$$
$$\left. - P\left(\frac{(X_n^{(1)})^{C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{(X_n^{(r)})^{C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon}}{\sqrt{n}}, A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)}\right) \right\| \leq L\epsilon. \tag{2.10}$$

Then, it is clear that it is sufficient to establish Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.1 for the $(X_n^{(v)})^{C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon}$'s.
Moreover, we obviously have that for any ϵ and for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\max_{v=1,\ldots,r} \sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} \mathbb{E}\left(|(X_{ij}^{(v)})^{C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon}|^p\right) < +\infty. \tag{2.11}$$

Then, (1.6) is a consequence of Theorem 5.4.5 in [3].

Moreover, note that, by definition, the distributions of the random variables $\sqrt{2}\Re e(X^{(v)})_{ij}^{C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon}, \sqrt{2}\Im m(X^{(v)})_{ij}^{C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon}, i < j, (X^{(v)})_{ii}^{C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon}$, $v = 1 \ldots, r$, are all a convolution of a centred Gaussian distribution with variance δ_ϵ^2, with some law with bounded support in the ball of radius $2C_\epsilon$; thus, according to Lemma 8.4, they satisfy a Poincaré inequality with some common constant $C_{PI}(C_\epsilon, \delta_\epsilon)$.

Hence in the following we will focus on establishing Theorem 1.1 and (1.11) *when the* $X_{ij}^{(v)}$*'s satisfy (H1) and (H2).*

3 Notations

The main part of the following consists in proving Lemma 1.3. For that purpose, we fix some integer number m and Hermitian $m \times m$ matrices $\{\alpha_v\}_{v=1,\ldots,r}, \{\beta_u\}_{u=1,\ldots,t}, \gamma$. To begin with, we introduce some notations on the set of matrices.

- $M_p(\mathbb{C})$ is the set of $p \times p$ matrices with complex entries, $M_p(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ the subset of self-adjoint elements of $M_p(\mathbb{C})$ and I_p the identity matrix. In the following, we shall consider two sets of matrices with $p = m$ (m fixed) and $p = n$ with $n \longrightarrow \infty$.

- Tr_p denotes the trace and $\mathrm{tr}_p = \frac{1}{p}\,\mathrm{Tr}_p$ the normalized trace on $M_p(\mathbb{C})$.

- $||.||$ denotes the spectral norm on $M_p(\mathbb{C})$ and $||M||_2 = (\mathrm{Tr}_p(M^*M))^{1/2}$ the Hilbert-Schmidt norm.

- id_p denotes the identity operator from $M_p(\mathbb{C})$ to $M_p(\mathbb{C})$.

- Let $(E_{ij})_{i,j=1}^n$ be the canonical basis of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and define a basis of the real vector space of the self-adjoint matrices $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{jj} &= E_{jj}, 1 \leq j \leq n \\ e_{jk} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_{jk} + E_{kj}), 1 \leq j < k \leq n \\ f_{jk} &= \frac{\sqrt{-1}}{\sqrt{2}}(E_{jk} - E_{kj}), 1 \leq j < k \leq n \end{aligned}$$

- For a matrix M in $M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$, we set

$$M_{ij} := (\mathrm{id}_m \otimes \mathrm{Tr}_n)(M(1_m \otimes E_{ji})) \in M_m(\mathbb{C}),\ 1 \leq i, j \leq n$$

and

$${}_{i,j}M := (\mathrm{Tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{id}_n)(M(\hat{E}_{ji} \otimes 1_n)) \in M_n(\mathbb{C}),\ 1 \leq i, j \leq m$$

where $(\hat{E}_{ij})$ is the canonical basis of $M_m(\mathbb{C})$.

- For any matrix $M \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ (or, more generally, any operator $M \in \mathcal{A}$), we define its real part to be $\Re eM = (M + M^*)/2$ and its imaginary part to be $\Im mM = (M - M^*)/2i$. We write $M > 0$ if the matrix M is postive definite and $M \geq 0$ if it is nonnegative definite. In general $M > P$ means that $M - P$ is positive definite.

We now define the random variables of interest. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ be a C^*-probability space with unit $1_{\mathcal{A}}$, equipped with a faithful tracial state and $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ be a semi-circular system in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$. Let $a_n = (a_n^{(1)}, \ldots, a_n^{(t)})$ be a t-tuple of noncommutative self-adjoint random variables which is free from x in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ and such that the distribution of a_n in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ coincides with the distribution of $(A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)})$ in $(M_n(\mathbb{C}), \mathrm{tr}_n)$.

- We define the random variable S_n with values in $M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$ by:

$$S_n = \gamma \otimes I_n + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes \frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}} + \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)} \tag{3.1}$$

and $s_n \in M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}$ by

$$s_n = \gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}.$$

- For any matrix λ in $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $Im(\lambda)$ is positive definite, we define the $M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$-valued respectively $M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}$-valued random variables:

$$R_n(\lambda) = (\lambda \otimes I_n - S_n)^{-1}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$r_n(\lambda) = (\lambda \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - s_n)^{-1},$$

and the $M_m(\mathbb{C})$-valued random variables:

$$H_n(\lambda) = (\mathrm{id}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n)[(\lambda \otimes I_n - S_n)^{-1}], \tag{3.3}$$

$$G_n(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}[H_n(\lambda)] \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\tilde{G}_n(\lambda) = \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau\left(r_n(\lambda)\right). \tag{3.5}$$

Since $\sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v$ is an $M_m(\mathbb{C})$-valued semicircular of variance $\eta\colon b \mapsto \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v b \alpha_v$ which is free over $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ from $\gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{s=1}^{t} \beta_s \otimes a_n^{(s)}$, we know from [5] (see proof of Theorem 8.3) that $\tilde{G}_n$ satisfies (see Section 4 Theorem 4.1 for $p = 1$)

$$\tilde{G}_n(\lambda) = G_{\sum_{s=1}^{t} \beta_s \otimes a_n^{(s)}}(\omega_n(\lambda)) \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$\omega_n(\lambda) = \lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) \alpha_v \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$G_{\sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}(\lambda) = \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left(\lambda \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)} \right)^{-1}.$$

For $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, we also define

$$g_n(z) = \mathrm{tr}_m(G_n(zI_m)) \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$\tilde{g}_n(z) = \mathrm{tr}_m(\tilde{G}_n(z1_m)). \tag{3.9}$$

- In the framework of Theorem 1.2 where we assume moreover the strong convergence of $(A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)})$, we define additional random variables. Let $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_t)$ be a t-tuple of noncommutative self-adjoint random variables which is free from x in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ and such that a is the strong limit of $(A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)})$. We define $s \in M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}$ by

$$s = \gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_u \tag{3.10}$$

and for any matrix λ in $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $Im(\lambda)$ is positive definite, we set

$$G(\lambda) = (id_m \otimes \tau)[(\lambda \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - s)^{-1}]. \tag{3.11}$$

Finally, for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$g(z) = \mathrm{tr}_m(G(\lambda I_m)).$$

In the sequel, we will say that a random term in some $M_p(\mathbb{C})$, depending on n, $\lambda \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\Im m\lambda$ is positive definite, the $\{\alpha_v\}_{v=1,\ldots,r}$, $\{\beta_u\}_{u=1,\ldots,t}$ and γ, is $O\left(\frac{1}{n^q}\right)$ if its operator norm is smaller than $\frac{Q\left(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|\right)}{n^q}$ for some deterministic polynomial Q whose coefficients are nonnegative real numbers and can depend on m, $\{\alpha_v\}_{v=1,\ldots,r}$, $\{\beta_u\}_{u=1,\ldots,t}$, γ.
K, C denote some positive constants and Q denotes some deterministic polynomial in one variable whose coefficients are nonnegative real numbers; they can depend on m, $\{\alpha_v\}_{v=1,\ldots,r}$, $\{\beta_u\}_{u=1,\ldots,t}$ and γ and they may vary from line to line.

4 Operator-valued subordination

In this section we introduce one of the main tools used in describing joint distributions of random variables that do not necessarily commute. It was a crucial insight of Voiculescu [36, 38] that J. L. Taylor's theory of free noncommutative functions [31] provides the appropriate analogue of the classical

Cauchy-Stieltjes transform for encoding operator-valued distributions [35], and hence joint distributions of q-tuples of noncommuting random variables. We shall only present below the case of relevance to our present work, and refer the reader to [35, 36, 38] for the general case and for the proofs of the main results.

Given a tracial $\mathcal{C}^*$-probability space $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ and a trace and order preserving unital $\mathcal{C}^*$ inclusion $M_m(\mathbb{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ (i.e. such that $I_m \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ identifies with the unit of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathrm{tr}_m(b) = \tau(b)$ for all $b \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$), there exists a conditional expectation $E\colon \mathcal{A} \to M_m(\mathbb{C})$, i.e. a linear map sending the unit to itself and such that $E(b_1 y b_2) = b_1 E(y) b_2$ for all $b_1, b_2 \in M_m(\mathbb{C}), y \in \mathcal{A}$ - see [13, Section II.6.10.13]). We will only be concerned with the trivial case of the canonical inclusion $M_m(\mathbb{C}) \subseteq M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}$ given by $b \mapsto b \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}$, when the conditional expectation is the partial trace: $E(b \otimes y) = (\mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau)(b \otimes y) = \tau(y)b$. The $M_m(\mathbb{C})$-valued distribution of an element $y \in \mathcal{A}$ with respect to E is by definition the family of multilinear functionals $\mu_y = \{\Psi_q\colon \underbrace{M_m(\mathbb{C}) \times \cdots \times M_m(\mathbb{C})}_{q \text{ times}} \to M_m(\mathbb{C})\colon \Psi_q(b_1, \ldots, b_q) = E(yb_1y \cdots b_qy), q \in \mathbb{N}\}$. By convention, $\Psi_0 = 1 \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$, $\Psi_1 = E(y)$.

For a given $y = y^* \in \mathcal{A}$ with distribution μ_y, define its noncommutative Cauchy-Stieltjes transform to be the *countable family* of maps $G_{\mu_y,p}(b) = (E \otimes \mathrm{id}_p)\left[(b - y \otimes I_p)^{-1}\right], p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Thus, $G_{\mu_y,1}(b) = E\left[(b-y)^{-1}\right], b \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$, $G_{\mu_y,2}(b) = (E \otimes \mathrm{id}_2)\left[\left(\begin{bmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} y & 0 \\ 0 & y \end{bmatrix}\right)^{-1}\right], b_{11}, b_{12}, b_{21}, b_{22} \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ etc. These maps are clearly analytic on the open sets $\{b \in M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_p(\mathbb{C})\colon b - y \otimes I_p$ invertible in $\mathcal{A} \otimes M_p(\mathbb{C})\}$. Two such sets will be important in this paper: the noncommutative upper half-plane $H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C})) = \{b \in M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_p(\mathbb{C})\colon \Im m\, b := (b - b^*)/2i > 0\}$, $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, and the "ball around infinity" $\{b \in M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_p(\mathbb{C})\colon b$ invertible, $\|b^{-1}\| < \|y\|^{-1}\}$ (actually only for $p = 1$). The maps $b \mapsto G_{\mu_y,p}(b^{-1})$ have thus an analytic extension around zero, which maps zero to zero and has the identity as first (Frechet) derivative. While $G_{\mu_y,p}$ does not map these "balls around infinity" into themselves, it does map $H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$ into $-H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$, and moreover $G_{\mu_y,p}(b)^{-1}$ maps $H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$ into itself (see [36, Section 3.6]). (In addition, the family of maps $\{G_{\mu_y,p}\}_{p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}}$ satisfy certain compatibility conditions that make them into free noncommutative maps - see [26]. It is known [40] that there is a bijection between such families of maps G that send for any $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, $H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$ into $-H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$ and have the above-described behavior on "balls around infinity" and $M_m(\mathbb{C})$-valued distributions of self-adjoint elements; however, since we will not make use of this correspondence,

we chose to only mention it in order to illustrate the parallel to the case of classical Stieltjes transforms, and direct the interested reader to [40] for details.)

As in scalar-valued free probability, one defines [35] *freeness with amalgamation* over $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ via an algebraic relation similar to (1.1), but involving E instead of τ and noncommutative polynomials with coefficients in $M_m(\mathbb{C})$. Since it is not important for us here, we refer the interested reader to [35] for more details. The essential result of Voiculescu that we will need in this paper is the following analytic subordination result:

Theorem 4.1. *With the above notations, assume that $y_1 = y_1^*, y_2 = y_2^* \in \mathcal{A}$ are free with amalgamation over $M_m(\mathbb{C})$. For any $p \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist analytic maps $\omega_{1,p}, \omega_{2,p} \colon H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C})) \to H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$ such that:*

1. *For all $b \in H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$, $\Im m\omega_{j,n}(b) \geq \Im mb$, $j = 1, 2$;*
2. *For all $b \in H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$*

$$G_{\mu_{y_1+y_2},p}(b) = G_{\mu_{y_1},p}(\omega_{1,p}(b)) = G_{\mu_{y_2},p}(\omega_{2,p}(b)) = [\omega_{1,p}(b) + \omega_{2,p}(b) - b]^{-1}$$

3. *$\omega_{1,p}, \omega_{2,p}$ are noncommutative maps in the sense of [31] (see [26]).*

The result as phrased here is a combination of parts of [36, Theorem 3.8] and [12, Theorem 2.7]. We shall use this theorem in the particular case when $y_2 = s$ is a centered *operator-valued semicircular* random variable (and actually only for $p = 1$). As for the scalar-valued semicircular centered random variables, it is uniquely determined by its variance $\eta \colon b \mapsto E(sbs)$, which is a completely positive self-map of $M_m(\mathbb{C})$. A characterization in terms of moments and cumulants via η is provided by Speicher in [30]. Given the context of our paper, we find it more useful to provide a characterization in terms of the noncommutative Cauchy-Stieltjes transform [21]: the functions $G_{\mu_s,p}$ are the unique solutions mapping $H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$ into $-H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C}))$ of the functional equations

$$G_p(b)^{-1} = b - (\eta \otimes \mathrm{id}_p)(G_p(b)), \quad b \in H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C})), p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Starting from this equation, it can be shown (see [5]) that the subordination function associated to a semicircular operator-valued random variable is particularly nice: if y_1 and s are free with amalgamation over $M_m(\mathbb{C})$, then

$$\omega_{1,p}(b) = b - (\eta \otimes \mathrm{id}_p)(G_{\mu_{y_1},p}(\omega_{1,p}(b))) = b - (\eta \otimes \mathrm{id}_p)(G_{\mu_{y_1+s},p}(b)), \quad (4.1)$$

for $b \in H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C})), p \in \mathbb{N}$, or, equivalently,

$$G_{\mu_{y_1},p}(b-(\eta\otimes \mathrm{id}_p)(G_{\mu_{y_1+s},p}(\omega_{1,p}(b))) = G_{\mu_{y_1+s},p}(b), \quad b \in H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C})), p \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.2}$$

This indicates that the $\omega_{1,p}$'s are injective maps on $H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C})), p \in \mathbb{N}$. Their left inverses are defined as

$$\Lambda_{1,p}(w) = w + (\eta \otimes \mathrm{id}_p)(G_{\mu_{y_1},p}(w)), \quad w \in H_p^+(M_m(\mathbb{C})), p \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{4.3}$$

Let us conclude this section by explaining how all this relates to the joint distributions of free random variables. It turns out (see, for example, [28], but it can be easily verified directly) that if $\{x_1 = x_1^*, \ldots, x_r = x_r^*\}, \{y_1 = y_1^*, \ldots, y_t = y_t^*\} \subset \mathcal{A}$ are free over $\mathbb{C}$ and for $v = 1, \ldots, r$, $\alpha_v = \alpha_v^*$, for $u = 1, \ldots, t$, $\beta_u = \beta_u^* \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$, then $\{\alpha_1 \otimes x_1, \ldots, \alpha_r \otimes x_r\}$ and $\{\beta_1 \otimes y_1, \ldots, \beta_t \otimes y_t\}$ are free with amalgamation over $M_m(\mathbb{C})$. Thus, they can be treated with the tools described above. Moreover, if $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ are free $\mathbb{C}$-valued semicircular centered random variables of variance one and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r$ are self-adjoint $m \times m$ complex matrices, then $\alpha_1 \otimes x_1 + \cdots + \alpha_r \otimes x_r$ is a centered $M_m(\mathbb{C})$-valued semicircular of variance $b \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j b \alpha_j$. These simple facts together with a linearization trick (see Section 6.1 and Step 1 of Section 7) will allow us in principle to treat, from the point of view of the Stieltjes transform, an r-tuple of Wigner matrices and constant matrices as we would treat a single Wigner matrix together with a single scalar matrix.

5 Proof of Lemma 1.3

5.1 Sharp estimates of Stieltjes transforms

The proof of (1.8) requires the sharp estimate (1.9) we are going to prove here.

According to Section 2, from now on, we assume that the $X_{ij}^{(v)}$'s satisfy (H1) and (H2). Note that these assumptions imply that for any $v \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$,

$$\forall (i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2,\ \kappa_1^{i,j,v} = 0,\ \kappa_2^{i,j,v} = 1,$$

$$\forall (i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2,\ , i \neq j,\ \tilde{\kappa}_1^{i,j,v} = 0,\ \tilde{\kappa}_2^{i,j,v} = 1$$

and for any $p \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\max_{v=1,\ldots,r} \sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} |\kappa_p^{i,j,v}| < +\infty, \quad \max_{v=1,\ldots,r} \sup_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{N}^2} |\tilde{\kappa}_p^{i,j,v}| < +\infty, \tag{5.1}$$

where for $i \neq j$, $(\kappa_p^{i,j,v})_{p\geq 1}$ and $(\tilde{\kappa}_p^{i,j,v})_{p\geq 1}$ denote the classical cumulants of $\sqrt{2}\Re e X_{ij}^{(v)}$ and $\sqrt{2}\Im m X_{ij}^{(v)}$ respectively and $(\kappa_p^{i,i,v})_{p\geq 1}$ denotes the classical cumulants of $X_{ii}^{(v)}$ (we set $(\tilde{\kappa}_p^{i,i,v})_{p\geq 1} \equiv 0$).

We start with preliminary variance estimates that will be useful in the proof. Thanks to (8.9), sticking to the proof (from "(4.6)" to "(4.13)") of Theorem 4.5 in [20], we similarly get

Lemma 5.1. *There exists some constant $C > 0$ such that, for any $n \geq 1$ and for any λ in $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\Im m\lambda$ is positive definite, we have*

- $$\mathbb{E}\{\|H_n(\lambda) - \mathbb{E}(H_n(\lambda))\|^2\} \leq \frac{Cm^3}{n^2}\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^4, \tag{5.2}$$
- *for any $(p,q) \in \{1,\dots,n\}^2$,*
$$\mathbb{E}\{\|(R_n(\lambda))_{pq} - \mathbb{E}((R_n(\lambda))_{pq})\|^2\} \leq \frac{Cm^3}{n}\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^4,$$
- *for any deterministic $nm \times nm$ matrices $F_n^{(1)}$ and $F_n^{(2)}$ such that $\|F_n^{(1)}\| \leq K$ and $\|F_n^{(2)}\| \leq K$, for any $(p,q) \in \{1,\dots,n\}^2$,*
$$\mathbb{E}\{\|\mathrm{id}_m \otimes tr_n(F_n^{(1)}R_n(\lambda)F_n^{(2)}) - \mathbb{E}(\mathrm{id}_m \otimes tr_n(F_n^{(1)}R_n(\lambda)F_n^{(2)}))\|^2\}$$
$$\leq \frac{K^4Cm^3}{n^2}\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^4,$$
$$\mathbb{E}\{\|(F_n^{(1)}R_n(\lambda)F_n^{(2)})_{pq} - \mathbb{E}((F_n^{(1)}R_n(\lambda)F_n^{(2)})_{pq})\|^2\}$$
$$\leq \frac{K^4Cm^3}{n}\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^4.$$

Now, we present our main technical tool (see [23]):

Lemma 5.2. *Let ξ be a real-valued random variable such that $\mathbb{E}(|\xi|^{p+2}) < \infty$. Let ϕ be a function from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{C}$ such that the first $p+1$ derivatives are continuous and bounded . Then,*

$$\mathbb{E}(\xi\phi(\xi)) = \sum_{a=0}^{p} \frac{\kappa_{a+1}}{a!}\mathbb{E}(\phi^{(a)}(\xi)) + \epsilon \tag{5.3}$$

where κ_a are the classical cumulants of ξ, $\epsilon \leq C \sup_t |\phi^{(p+1)}(t)|\mathbb{E}(|\xi|^{p+2})$, C depends on p only.

In the following, we shall apply this identity with a function $\phi(\xi)$ given by the entries of the resolvent of S_n. It follows from Lemma 8.3 and (8.5) below that the conditions of Lemma 5.2 (bounded derivatives) are fulfilled. We first need the following preliminary lemma.

Lemma 5.3. *For any $\lambda \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\Im m\lambda$ is positive definite, $(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v) \otimes I_n - \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)}$ and $(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v \tilde{G}_n(\lambda)\alpha_v) \otimes I_n - \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)}$ are invertible. Set*

$$Y_n(\lambda) = \left((\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v) \otimes I_n - \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)} \right)^{-1} \tag{5.4}$$

and

$$\tilde{Y}_n(\lambda) = \left((\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{=1}^r \alpha_v \tilde{G}_n(\lambda)\alpha_v) \otimes I_n - \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)} \right)^{-1}. \tag{5.5}$$

We have

$$\|Y_n(\lambda)\| \leq \|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\| \tag{5.6}$$

and

$$\left\|\tilde{Y}_n(\lambda)\right\| \leq \|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|. \tag{5.7}$$

Proof. We only present the proof for $Y_n(\lambda)$ since the proof is similar for $\tilde{Y}_n(\lambda)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Im m\left[(\lambda \otimes I_n - S_n)^{-1}\right] &= \frac{1}{2i}\left[(\lambda \otimes I_n - S_n)^{-1} - (\lambda^* \otimes I_n - S_n)^{-1}\right] \\ &= -(\lambda \otimes I_n - S_n)^{-1}(\Im m\lambda \otimes I_n)(\lambda^* \otimes I_n - S_n)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields that $-\Im m R_n(\lambda)$ is positive definite. Since the map $\mathrm{id}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n$ is positive we can deduce that $-\Im m H_n(\lambda)$ is positive and then that $-\Im m G_n(\lambda)$ is positive. It readily follows that

$$\Im m\left[\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\right] \geq \Im m\lambda \tag{5.8}$$

and then

$$\Im m\left[\left(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\right) \otimes I_n - \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)}\right] \geq \Im m\lambda \otimes I_n.$$

Hence Lemma 5.3 follows by lemma 3.1 in [20]. □

Theorem 5.4. *For any $\lambda \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\Im m\lambda$ is positive definite, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(R_n(\lambda)\right) = Y_n(\lambda) + Y_n(\lambda)\Xi(\lambda) \tag{5.9}$$

where $Y_n(\lambda)$ is defined in Lemma 5.3 and $\Xi(\lambda) = \sum_{l,j} \Xi_{lj}(\lambda) \otimes E_{lj}$ satisfies that there exists a polynomial Q with nonnegative coefficients such that for all $l, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$\|\Xi_{lj}(\lambda) - \Psi_{lj}(\lambda)\| \leq \frac{Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{n^2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{lj}(\lambda) \;=\; & \sum_{v=1}^{r} \Bigg\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_v[H_n(\lambda) - \mathbb{E}(H_n(\lambda))]\alpha_v[R_n(\lambda)]_{lj}\right] \\
& + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ 1 - \delta_{il}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\right\} M^{(3)}(v,i,l,j) \\
& + \frac{1}{4n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{il}\right) M^{(4)}(v,i,l,j) \\
& + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[1 - \delta_{il}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\right)\right] M^{(5)}(v,i,l,j) \Bigg\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
& M^{(3)}(v,i,l,j) \\
= \;& \mathbb{E}\{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} + \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& + (\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& + (\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& + (\kappa_3^{i,l,v} + \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}\},
\end{aligned}$$

$M^{(4)}(v,i,l,j)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \quad & (\kappa_4^{i,l,v} + \tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})\mathbb{E}\{\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}\} \\
& +(\kappa_4^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})\mathbb{E}\{\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \quad (5.11) \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \quad (5.12) \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \quad (5.13) \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}\}, \quad (5.14)
\end{aligned}
$$

$M^{(5)}(v,i,l,j)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= \quad & \mathbb{E}\{(\kappa_5^{i,l,v} + \tilde{\kappa}_5^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1}) \\
& \times[\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj}] \\
& +(\kappa_5^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_5^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1}) \\
& [\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj}] \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\
& +\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}]\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover for any $p,q \in \{1,\ldots,n\}^2$, *for any* $mn \times mn$ *matrix* $F_n(\lambda)$ *such that* $F_n(\lambda) = O(1)$, *setting* $\Psi(\lambda) = \sum_{l,j} \Psi_{lj}(\lambda) \otimes E_{lj}$, *we have*

$$\{Y_n(\lambda)\Psi(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)\}_{pq}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}}\sum_{v=1}^{r}\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})(Y_n)_{pl} \tag{5.15}$$

$$\times\,\mathbb{E}\{\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\}$$

$$+O_{p,q}(\frac{1}{n}) \tag{5.16}$$

where there exists a polynomial Q with nonnegative coefficients such that for all $p,q\in\{1,\ldots,n\}$,

$$\|O_{p,q}\|\leq\frac{Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{n}. \tag{5.17}$$

Proof. We shall apply formula (5.3) to the $M_m(\mathbb{C})$-valued function $\phi(\xi)=(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}$ for $1\leq i,j\leq n$ and ξ is one of the variable $\frac{X_{kk}^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}$, $\sqrt{2}\frac{Re(X_{kl}^{(v)})}{\sqrt{n}}$, $\sqrt{2}\frac{Im(X_{kl}^{(v)})}{\sqrt{n}}$ for $1\leq k<l\leq n$ and $1\leq v\leq r$.
We notice that

$$\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial Re(\frac{X_{kk}^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}})}=\phi'_{\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}}.e_{kk},\ \frac{X_{kk}^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}=\mathrm{Tr}(\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}e_{kk}),\ 1\leq k\leq n,$$

$$\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\sqrt{2}Re(\frac{X_{kl}^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}})}=\phi'_{\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}}.e_{kl},\ \sqrt{2}Re(\frac{X_{kl}^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}})=\mathrm{Tr}(\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}e_{kl}),\ 1\leq k<l\leq n,$$

$$\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial\sqrt{2}Im(\frac{X_{kl}^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}})}=\phi'_{\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}}.f_{kl},\ \sqrt{2}Im(\frac{X_{kl}^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}})=\mathrm{Tr}(\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}f_{kl}),\ 1\leq k<l\leq n.$$

Let $1\leq k<l\leq n$ be fixed. For simplicity, we write ϕ', ϕ'', ϕ''' and ϕ'''' for the first derivatives of ϕ with respect to $\sqrt{2}Re(\frac{X_{kl}^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}})$. Then, according to (8.5),

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi' &= [R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)]_{ij}\\
\phi'' &= 2\,[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)]_{ij}\\
\phi''' &= 6\,[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)]_{ij}\\
\phi'''' &= 24\,[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)]_{ij}
\end{aligned}$$

Writing (5.3) in this setting gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Tr}(\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}e_{kl})(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}] = \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}[\phi'] + \frac{\kappa_3^{k,l,v}}{2n\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}[\phi''] + \frac{\kappa_4^{k,l,v}}{6n^2}\mathbb{E}[\phi'''] + \frac{\kappa_5^{k,l,v}}{24n^2\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}[\phi''''] + O_{k,l,i,j,v}\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right) \tag{5.18}$$

where there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $k, l, i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and every $v \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$,

$$\left\| O_{k,l,i,j}\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right) \right\| \leq \frac{C\|\alpha_v\|^5 \|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^6}{n^3}, \tag{5.19}$$

with the analogous equations with f_{kl} and e_{kk} replacing the $\kappa_i^{k,l,v}$'s by the $\tilde{\kappa}_i^{k,l,v}$'s and $\kappa_i^{k,k,v}$'s respectively.

Noticing that for $k < l$,

$$E_{kl} = \frac{e_{kl} - \sqrt{-1}f_{kl}}{\sqrt{2}} \text{ and } E_{lk} = \frac{e_{kl} + \sqrt{-1}f_{kl}}{\sqrt{2}},$$

we deduce that :

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Tr}(\tfrac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}E_{kl})(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}] \\
= \;& \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes E_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_3^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&-\sqrt{-1}\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_3^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda))\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_4^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n^2}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&-\sqrt{-1}\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_4^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n^2}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_5^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}} \\
&\quad\times\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&-\sqrt{-1}\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_5^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}} \\
&\quad\times\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+O_{l,k,i,j,v}\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Tr}(\tfrac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}E_{lk})(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}] \\
= \;& \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes E_{lk}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_3^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\sqrt{-1}\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_3^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda))\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_4^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n^2}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\sqrt{-1}\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_4^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n^2}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_5^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}} \\
&\quad\times\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\sqrt{-1}\frac{\tilde{\kappa}_5^{k,l,v}}{\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}} \\
&\quad\times\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes f_{kl}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+O_{k,l,i,j,v}\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Tr}(\tfrac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}E_{kk})(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}] \\
= \;& \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{E}\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes E_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_3^{k,k,v}}{n\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_4^{k,k,v}}{n^2}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+\frac{\kappa_5^{k,k,v}}{n^2\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\left\{\left[R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \otimes e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)e_{kk}R_n(\lambda)\right]_{ij}\right\} \\
&+O_{k,k,i,j,v}\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the $O_{k,l,i,j}\left(\frac{1}{n^3}\right)$'s satisfy (5.19). We then obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[(\alpha_v \otimes \frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}})R_n(\lambda)]_{lj} &= \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_v H_n(\lambda)\alpha_v[R_n(\lambda)]_{lj}\right] \\ &+\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{1-\delta_{il}\left(1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\right\}M^{(3)}(v,i,l,j) \\ &+\frac{1}{4n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\delta_{il}\right)M^{(4)}(v,i,l,j) \\ &+\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{1-\delta_{il}\left(1-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\right)\right\}M^{(5)}(v,i,l,j) \\ &+O_{l,j,v}(1/n^2), \qquad (5.20)\end{aligned}$$

where the $M^{(q)}(v,i,l,j)$ for $q=3,4,5$ are defined in Theorem 5.4 and there exists $C>0$ such that for every $l,j\in\{1,\ldots,n\}$ and any $v\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$,

$$\left\|O_{l,j,v}\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right\| \leq \frac{C\|\alpha_v\|^5\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^6}{n^2}. \qquad (5.21)$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v=1}^{r}(\alpha_v\otimes X_n^{(v)})R_n(\lambda) &= (S_n-\sum_{u=1}^{t}\beta_u\otimes A_n^{(u)}-\gamma\otimes I_n)(\lambda\otimes I_n-S_n)^{-1} \\ &= -I_m\otimes I_n+\left[(\lambda-\gamma)\otimes I_n-\sum_{u=1}^{t}\beta_u\otimes A_n^{(u)}\right]R_n(\lambda)\end{aligned}$$

implying

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v=1}^{r}\mathbb{E}[(\alpha_v\otimes\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}})R_n(\lambda)]_{lj} &= -\delta_{jl}I_m+(\lambda-\gamma)\mathbb{E}(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} \\ &\quad -\left[\sum_{u=1}^{t}\beta_u\otimes A_n^{(u)}\mathbb{E}(R_n(\lambda))\right]_{lj}. \qquad (5.22)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_v H_n(\lambda)\alpha_v[R_n(\lambda)]_{lj}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_v[H_n(\lambda)-\mathbb{E}(H_n(\lambda))]\alpha_v[R_n(\lambda)]_{lj}\right] \\ &\quad +\alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[[R_n(\lambda)]_{lj}\right]. \qquad (5.23)\end{aligned}$$

Hence (5.20), (5.22) and (5.23) yield

$$-\delta_{jl}I_m + (\lambda-\gamma)\mathbb{E}(R_n(\lambda))_{lj} - \left[\sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)}\mathbb{E}(R_n(\lambda))\right]_{lj}$$
$$= \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[[R_n(\lambda)]_{lj}\right] + \Xi_{lj}(\lambda) \tag{5.24}$$

where

$$\Xi_{lj}(\lambda) = \Psi_{lj}(\lambda) + O_{l,j}(1/n^2),$$

Ψ_{lj} is defined in Theorem 5.4 and $O_{l,j}(1/n^2)$ satisfies:

$$\exists C>0,\ \forall l,j\in\{1,\ldots,n\},\ \left\|O_{l,j}(1/n^2)\right\| \le C\frac{\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^6}{n^2}. \tag{5.25}$$

Thus, we have

$$\left[\left(\lambda-\gamma-\sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\right)\otimes I_n - \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u\otimes A_n^{(u)}\right]\mathbb{E}(R_n(\lambda)) = I_n\otimes I_m + \Xi(\lambda).$$

(5.9) readily follows.

Now, we are going to prove (5.16). Let us fix $v\in\{1,\ldots,r\}$. Let us first study the terms corresponding to the $M^{(3)}(v,i,l,j)$'s. We have for some constant C such that $\sup_{i,l,v}\{|\kappa_3^{i,l,v}| + |\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}|\} \le C$,

$$\left\|\sum_{i,j,l=1}^n \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{n\sqrt{n}}(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\mathbb{E}\{\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj}(F_n(\lambda))_{jq}\right\|$$

$$\le \frac{C\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|\|\alpha_v\|^3}{n\sqrt{n}}\sum_{l,i=1}^n \|(Y_n)_{pl}\|\,\|(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\|\left\|(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{lq}\right\|$$

$$\le \frac{C\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|\|\alpha_v\|^3}{n\sqrt{n}}\sum_{l=1}^n \|(Y_n)_{pl}\|\left\|(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{lq}\right\|\sqrt{n}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^n\|(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\|^2\right\}^{1/2}$$

$$\le \frac{C\sqrt{m}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^2\|\alpha_v\|^3}{n}\left\{\sum_{l=1}^n\|(Y_n)_{pl}\|^2\right\}^{1/2}\left\{\sum_{l=1}^n\left\|(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{lq}\right\|^2\right\}^{1/2}$$

(using (8.3) and (8.7))

$$\le \frac{Cm\sqrt{m}\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^3\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^4}{n}$$

$$= O(1/n)$$

(using (8.3) − (5.6) and (8.2) − (8.7)).

Similarly, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{i,j,l=1}^{n} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl} \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}\{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj}(F_n(\lambda))_{jq} \right\|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{Cm\sqrt{m}\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^3 \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^4}{n} \\ &= O(1/n). \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i,j,l=1}^{n} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl} \mathbb{E}\{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} + \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}(F_n(\lambda))_{jq}\} \right\|$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \frac{C\|\alpha_v\|^3}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{l,i=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\| \, \|(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^2 \left\|(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{C\|\alpha_v\|^3}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^4 \right\}^{1/2} \left\|(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{C\sqrt{m}\|\alpha_v\|^3 \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\|(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right\| \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^4 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\quad \text{(using (8.3) and (5.6))} \\ &\leq \frac{C\sqrt{m}\|\alpha_v\|^3}{n\sqrt{n}} \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\| \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n} \left\|(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right\|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \|(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^4 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{Cm\sqrt{m}\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^3}{n} \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^4 \\ &= O(1/n) \\ &\quad \text{(using (8.2) and (8.8)).} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j,l=1}^{n} \kappa_3^{l,l,v} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl} \mathbb{E}\{\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj}(F_n(\lambda))_{jq}\} \right\|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{C\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^3 \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^3}{n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\| \\
&\leq \frac{C\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^3 \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^3}{n} \left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{C\sqrt{m}\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^3}{n} \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^4 \\
&= 0(1/n) \\
&\quad \text{(using (8.3) and (5.6)).}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, let us study the terms corresponding to the $M^{(4)}(v,i,l,j)$'s. Let C be some constant such that $\sup_{i,l,v}\{|\kappa_4^{i,l,v}| + |\tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v}|\} \leq C$. First, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{i,j,l=1}^{n} \frac{(1-\delta_{il}/2)(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})}{n^2} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \times \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lj}\right](F_n(\lambda))_{jq} \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{C\|\alpha_v\|^4}{n^2} \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^3 \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{lq}\|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{mC\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4}{n} \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^5 \\
&= O(1/n)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (8.2), (8.3), (5.6) and (8.7) in the last lines. In the same spirit,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i,j,l=1}^{n} (1-\delta_{il}/2)(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \times \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ij}\right](F_n(\lambda))_{jq} \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{C\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4 \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^3}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n} \|R_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{mC\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4 \left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^5}{n} \\
&= O(1/n)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (8.3), (5.6) and (8.7) in the last lines.

All the other terms corresponding to the $M^{(4)}(v,i,l,j)$'s contain at least one $(R_n(\lambda))_{il}$ or at least one $(R_n(\lambda))_{li}$ and can be bounded similarly by $\frac{mC\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4}{n}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^5$ (using (8.2) or (8.3)).

Let C be some constant such that $\sup_{i,l,v}\{|\kappa_5^{i,l,v}|+|\tilde{\kappa}_5^{i,l,v}|\}\leq C$. For the terms in $\{Y_n(\lambda)\Psi(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)\}_{pq}$ corresponding to $M^{(5)}(v,i,l,j)$'s, note that using (8.7) they can be all obviously bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{C\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^5\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^5}{n\sqrt{n}}\sum_{l=1}^n\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\| \\
&\leq \frac{C\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^5\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^5}{n}\left\{\sum_{l=1}^n\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{\sqrt{m}C\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^5\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^6}{n} \\
&= O(1/n)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (8.3) and (5.6).

Finally define

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}=[\alpha_v[H_n(\lambda)-\mathbb{E}(H_n(\lambda))]\alpha_v]\otimes I_n$$

so that there exists some constant $C>0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j,l=1}^n(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_v[H_n(\lambda)-\mathbb{E}(H_n(\lambda))]\alpha_v[R_n(\lambda)]_{lj}(F_n(\lambda)_{jq}\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[[Y_n(\lambda)\hat{\mathcal{R}}R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)]_{pq}\right] \\
&\leq \|F_n(\lambda)\|\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^2\mathbb{E}\left[\|\hat{\mathcal{R}}\|\right] \\
&\leq \frac{C\sqrt{m}\|F_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^2}{n}\|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^4 \\
&= O(1/n).
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (5.6), (8.7) and (5.2) in the last lines.
(5.16) follows.

□

Corollary 5.5. *For any $mn\times mn$ matrix $F_n(\lambda)$ such that $F_n(\lambda)=O(1)$, we have*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[[R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)]_{pq}\right] \\
&\quad = \left(Y_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)\right)_{pq} \\
&\qquad + \sum_{v=1}^{r}\sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v(Y_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(Y_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right] \\
&\qquad + O_{p,q}(1/n),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the $O_{p,q}(1/n)$'s satisfy (5.17).

Proof. Noticing that, with the $O_{l,j}(1/n^2)$'s satisfying (5.25), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{l,j=1}^{n} \left(Y_n(\lambda)\right)_{pl} O_{l,j}\left(1/n^2\right) \left(F_n(\lambda)\right)_{jq} \right\| \\
&\quad \leq \frac{C\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^6}{n^2} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{n} \| \left(Y_n(\lambda)\right)_{pl} \|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \| \left(F_n(\lambda)\right)_{jq} \|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad \leq \frac{Cm\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^7 \|F_n(\lambda)\|}{n} = O(1/n),
\end{aligned}
$$

(using Lemma 8.1 and (5.6) in the last line) it readily follows from Theorem 5.4 that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[[R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)]_{pq}\right] \\
&\quad = \left(Y_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)\right)_{pq} \\
&\qquad + \sum_{v=1}^{r}\sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right] \\
&\qquad + O_{p,q}(1/n),
\end{aligned}
$$

where the $O_{p,q}(1/n)$'s satisfy (5.17).

To simplify the writing let us set $U_i = \alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}$, $V_l = \alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}$ and $W_i = \alpha_v(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left[U_iV_lW_i\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[(U_i - \mathbb{E}(U_i))(V_l - \mathbb{E}(V_l))W_i\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}\left[(U_i - \mathbb{E}(U_i))\mathbb{E}(V_l)(W_i - \mathbb{E}(W_i))\right] \\
&+ \mathbb{E}(U_i)\mathbb{E}\left[(V_l - \mathbb{E}(V_l))(W_i - \mathbb{E}(W_i))\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[U_i\right]\mathbb{E}\left[V_l\right]\mathbb{E}\left[W_i\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Now,

$$\left\|\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\mathbb{E}\left[(U_i-\mathbb{E}(U_i))(V_l-\mathbb{E}(V_l))W_i\right]\right\|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\|\alpha_v\|\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|\|F_n(\lambda)\| \\
&\qquad\times\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\|U_i-\mathbb{E}\left(U_i\right)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\|V_l-\mathbb{E}\left(V_l\right)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{n}C\|\alpha_v\|\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|\|F_n(\lambda)\|\left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n}\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\qquad\times\left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\|V_l-\mathbb{E}\left(V_l\right)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\|U_i-\mathbb{E}\left(U_i\right)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\left\|\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\mathbb{E}\left[(U_i-\mathbb{E}(U_i))\mathbb{E}(V_l)(W_i-\mathbb{E}(W_i))\right]\right\|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\|\alpha_v\|\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\| \\
&\qquad\times\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\|U_i-\mathbb{E}\left(U_i\right)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}\left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\|W_i-\mathbb{E}\left(W_i\right)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{n}C\|\alpha_v\|\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|\left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n}\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad\times\left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\|W_i-\mathbb{E}\left(W_i\right)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathbb{E}\left(\|U_i-\mathbb{E}\left(U_i\right)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$\left\|\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\mathbb{E}\left[U_i\right]\mathbb{E}\left[(V_l-\mathbb{E}(V_l))(W_i-\mathbb{E}(W_i))\right]\right\|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq C\|\alpha_v\|\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\| \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\| \\
&\quad \times \left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\|V_l - \mathbb{E}(V_l)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2} \left\{\mathbb{E}\left(\|W_i - \mathbb{E}(W_i)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{n}C\|\alpha_v\|\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\| \left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right\}^{1/2} \\
&\quad \times \left\{\sum_{l=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(\|V_l - \mathbb{E}(V_l)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2} \left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left(\|W_i - \mathbb{E}(W_i)\|^2\right)\right\}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Lemma 5.1, (8.3) and (5.6), we readily deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[[R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)]_{pq}\right] \\
&= \left(Y_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)\right)_{pq} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{v=1}^{r} \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} (\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})(Y_n(\lambda)_{pl}\alpha_v \qquad (5.26) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\right]\alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\right]\alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right] \\
&\quad + O_{p,q}(1/n), \qquad (5.27)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the $O_{p,q}(1/n)$'s satisfy (5.17). Now, define

$$
\mathcal{R} = \sum_{v=1}^{r} \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} (\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})\alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\right]\alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\right]\alpha_v \otimes E_{li},
$$

It is easy to see that $\|\mathcal{R}\| \leq C\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^2 n$. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\sum_{v=1}^{r}\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\right] \\
&\qquad \times \alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\right]\alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right] = \left[Y_n(\lambda)\mathcal{R}\mathbb{E}(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))\right]_{pq}.
\end{aligned}
$$

So that if we define

$$
T = \sum_{p,q=1}^{n} T_{pq} \otimes E_{pq}
$$

where

$$
T_{pq} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} \sum_{v=1}^{r} \sum_{l,i=1}^{n} (\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\right]
$$

$$\times \alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\right] \alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right],$$

we have

$$\|T\| = \left\| \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} Y_n(\lambda) \mathcal{R}\mathbb{E}(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)) \right\| = O(1/\sqrt{n}). \tag{5.28}$$

Hence, in particular we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[[R_n(\lambda)F_n]_{pq}\right] = \left(Y_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda)\right)_{pq} + O_{p,q}(1/\sqrt{n}), \tag{5.29}$$

where there exists a polynomial Q with nonnegative coefficients such that for any $p, q \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$\|O_{p,q}(1/\sqrt{n})\| \leq \frac{Q(\|\Im m(\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{\sqrt{n}}. \tag{5.30}$$

Now, with the $O_{i,i}(1/\sqrt{n})$'s satisfying (5.30), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl} \alpha_v O_{i,i}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}) \alpha_v (Y_n(\lambda))_{ll} \alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right] \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{C\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|}{n} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n} \|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right]\|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\qquad \times \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \|O_{i,i}(1/\sqrt{n})\|^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\
&= O_{p,q}(\frac{1}{n})
\end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

with the $O_{p,q}(\frac{1}{n})$'s satisfying (5.17), where we used (8.3) twice and (5.6) and (8.7) in the last line. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl} \alpha_v (Y_n(\lambda))_{ii} \alpha_v O_{l,l}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}) \alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right] \right\| \\
&\qquad = O_{p,q}(\frac{1}{n}),
\end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

$$\left\| \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n\sqrt{n}} (Y_n(\lambda))_{pl} \alpha_v O_{i,i}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}) \alpha_v O_{l,l}(1/\sqrt{n}) \alpha_v \mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(\lambda)F_n(\lambda))_{iq}\right] \right\|$$

$$= O_{p,q}(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}) \tag{5.33}$$

(5.27), (5.29) and (5.31), (5.32), (5.33) readily yields Corollary 5.5. □

Corollary 5.6. *With the notations of Section 3,*

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(\lambda) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathrm{id}_m \otimes tr_n R_n(\lambda)\right) \\ &= G_{\sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}\left(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\right) \\ &\quad + L_n(\lambda) + \epsilon_n(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$L_n(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{p=1}^n \left[Y_n(\lambda)\Psi(\lambda)\right]_{pp},$$

(with $\Psi(\lambda)$ defined in Theorem 5.4 and $Y_n(\lambda)$ defined in Lemma 5.3) and

$$\epsilon_n(\lambda) = O\left(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\right).$$

Moreover

$$L_n(\lambda) = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{5.34}$$

Proof. First note that, since the distribution of $a_n = (a_n^{(1)}, \ldots, a_n^{(t)})$ in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ coincides with the distribution of $(A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)})$ in $(M_n(\mathbb{C}), \mathrm{tr}_n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{id}_m \otimes tr_n Y_n(\lambda) &= \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau\left((\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{s=1}^t \beta_s \otimes a_n^{(s)}\right)^{-1} \\ &= G_{\sum_{s=1}^t \beta_s \otimes a_n^{(s)}}\left(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the corollary readily follows from Theorem 5.4 by noting that

- if there exists a polynomial Q with nonnegative coefficients such that for every $l, p \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$,

$$\|O_{l,p}(1/n^2)\| \leq \frac{Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{n^2},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tfrac{1}{n}\|\sum_{p,l=1}^{n}(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}O_{lp}(1/n^2)\| \\
&\qquad \leq \frac{1}{n}\left(\sum_{p,l=1}^{n}\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right)^{1/2}\left(\sum_{p,l=1}^{n}\|O_{lp}(1/n^2)\|^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\qquad = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}})
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 8.1 and (5.6) in the last line.

- $$\begin{aligned}
&\|\sum_{i,l,p=1}^{n}\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{n^2\sqrt{n}}(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\mathbb{E}\{\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ip}\| \\
&\quad \leq \frac{C\|\alpha_v\|^3\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^2}{n^2}\sum_{l,p=1}^{n}\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|(R_n(\lambda))_{ip}\|^2\right)^{1/2} \\
&\quad \leq \frac{C\sqrt{m}\|\alpha_v\|^3\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^3}{n}\left(\sum_{p,l=1}^{n}\|(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\|^2\right)^{1/2} = O(1/\sqrt{n})
\end{aligned}$$

  where we used Lemma 8.1, (8.7) and (5.6) in the two last lines.

□

Theorem 5.7. *Let λ be in $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\Im m\lambda > 0$, and $\tilde{G}_n(\lambda)$ as defined in* (3.5)*. We have*

$$G_n(\lambda) - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) + E_n(\lambda) = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}), \tag{5.35}$$

where $E_n(\lambda)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_n(\lambda) = \\
&\sum_{v=1}^{r}\tilde{G}_n'(\lambda)\cdot\alpha_v L_n(\lambda)\alpha_v - \frac{1}{2}\tilde{G}_n''(\lambda)\cdot\left(\sum_{v=1}^{r}\alpha_v L_n(\lambda)\alpha_v, \sum_{v=1}^{r}\alpha_v L_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\right) - L_n(\lambda)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

with $L_n(\lambda)$ defined in Corollary 5.6.

Proof. Let λ be in $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\Im m\lambda > 0$. Note that according to (5.8), we have $\Im m\left(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\right) > 0$. Define (using the notations of Section 3)

$$\Lambda_n(\lambda) = \gamma + \lambda + \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_{\sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}(\lambda)\alpha_v \tag{5.37}$$

and $\lambda' = \Lambda_n(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v)$. Using Corollary 5.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda' - \lambda &= -\sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v + \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_{\sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v)\alpha_v \\
&= -\sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v L_n(\lambda)\alpha_v + O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}) \qquad (5.38) \\
&= O(1/\sqrt{n}). \qquad (5.39)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus there exists a polynomial Q with nonnegative coefficients such that

$$\left\|\lambda' - \lambda\right\| \leq \frac{Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

-On the one hand, if

$$\frac{Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{1}{2\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|},$$

or equivalently

$$1 \leq \frac{2\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{\sqrt{n}}, \tag{5.40}$$

to prove (5.35) it is enough to prove that

$$G_n(\lambda) - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) + E_n(\lambda) = O(1). \tag{5.41}$$

Indeed, if we assume that (5.40) and (5.41) hold, then there exists a polynomial $\tilde{Q}$ with nonnegative coefficients such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|G_n(\lambda) - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) + E_n(\lambda)\right\| &\leq \tilde{Q}(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|) \\
&\leq \tilde{Q}(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)\frac{2\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{\sqrt{n}} \\
&\leq \tilde{Q}(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)(\frac{2\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{\sqrt{n}})^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$G_n(\lambda) - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) + E_n(\lambda) = O(\frac{1}{n^2})$$

so that (5.35) holds. To prove (5.41), one can notice that, using (8.7) and (8.6), both $G_n(\lambda)$ and $\tilde{G}_n(\lambda)$ are bounded by $\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|$, and that

$$\|E_n(\lambda)\|$$

$$\leq \left\{ r \max_{v=1}^{r} \|\alpha_v\|^2 \|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^2 + 1 \right\} \|L_n(\lambda)\| + r^2 \max_{v=1}^{r} \|\alpha_v\|^4 \|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|^3 \|L_n(\lambda)\|^2 ,$$

where $L_n(\lambda) = O(1/\sqrt{n})$ according to (5.34).

-On the other hand, if

$$\frac{Q(\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|)}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{1}{2\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|},$$

one has :

$$\left\|\Im m\lambda' - \Im m\lambda\right\| \leq \left\|\lambda' - \lambda\right\| \leq \frac{1}{2\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\|} \tag{5.42}$$

Denoting for any Hermitian matrix H by $l_1(H)$ the smallest eigenvalue of H, we readily deduce from (5.42) that $l_1(\Im m\lambda') \geq \frac{l_1(\Im m\lambda)}{2}$ and therefore

$$\Im m\lambda' > 0. \tag{5.43}$$

Then, it makes sense to consider $\tilde{G}_n(\lambda')$ which satisfies according to (3.6)

$$\tilde{G}_n(\lambda') = G_{\sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}(\lambda' - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \tilde{G}_n(\lambda')\alpha_v) = G_{\sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}\left(\omega_n(\lambda')\right)$$

$$= G_{\sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}\left(\omega_n(\Lambda_n(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v))\right). \tag{5.44}$$

Now, we will use the following

Lemma 5.8. *With ω_n and Λ_n defined in* (3.7) *and* (5.37)*, when $\Im m\rho > 0$ and $\Im m\Lambda_n(\rho) > 0$ we have*

$$\omega_n(\Lambda_n(\rho)) = \rho.$$

Proof. The equality $\Lambda_n(\omega_n(\rho)) = \rho$ holds tautologically for all ρ with $\Im\rho > 0$ (see (4.3)). Let us first show that the equality $\omega_n(\Lambda_n(\rho)) = \rho$ holds when ρ has a small enough inverse. The map Λ_n has a power series expansion

$$\Lambda_n(\rho) = \rho + \gamma + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau) \left(\rho^{-1} \left[\sum_{u=1}^{t} (\beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}) \rho^{-1} \right]^k \right) \right) \alpha_v,$$

convergent when $\|\rho^{-1}\| < \left\| \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)} \right\|^{-1}$. For simplicity we let $h(\lambda) = \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau) \left(\lambda \left[\sum_{u=1}^{t} (\beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}) \lambda \right]^k \right) \right) \alpha_v$, norm convergent on a ball of radius $\left\| \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)} \right\|^{-1}$ and fixing zero. Performing the change of variable $\lambda = \rho^{-1}$, we obtain $\Lambda_n(\rho) = \Lambda_n(\lambda^{-1}) = \lambda^{-1} + \gamma + h(\lambda)$. Then $(\Lambda_n(\lambda^{-1}))^{-1} = (\lambda^{-1} + \gamma + h(\lambda))^{-1} = \lambda(1 + (\gamma + h(\lambda))\lambda)^{-1}$, which is analytic on the set of all $\lambda \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\|\lambda\| < \left\| \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)} \right\|^{-1}$ and $\|\gamma + h(\lambda)\| < \|\lambda\|^{-1}$.

Define $\check{\Lambda}_n(\rho) = (\Lambda_n(\rho^{-1}))^{-1}$ and $\check{\omega}_n(\rho) = (\omega_n(\rho^{-1}))^{-1}$. We have established above that $\check{\Lambda}_n$ is analytic on a neighbourhood of zero, and a direct computation shows that $\check{\Lambda}_n(0) = 0, \check{\Lambda}_n'(0) = \mathrm{id}$. The inverse function theorem for analytic maps allows us to conclude that there exists a neighbourhood of zero on which $\check{\Lambda}_n$ has a unique inverse which fixes zero and whose derivative at zero is equal to the identity. The map $\check{\omega}_n$ is shown precisely the same way to satisfy the same properties as $\check{\Lambda}_n$. In particular, for $\|\rho\|$ small enough, $\check{\Lambda}_n(\check{\omega}_n(\rho)) = (\Lambda_n(\check{\omega}_n(\rho)^{-1}))^{-1} = (\Lambda_n(((\omega_n(\rho^{-1}))^{-1})^{-1}))^{-1} = (\Lambda_n(\omega_n(\rho^{-1}))^{-1} = (\rho^{-1})^{-1} = \rho$ for any ρ with strictly positive imaginary part. Since zero is in the closure of $\{\rho \in M_m(\mathbb{C})\colon \Im\rho > 0\}$, it follows that $\check{\omega}_n$ and $\check{\Lambda}_n$ are compositional inverses to each other on a small enough neighbourhood of zero. We conclude that for all ρ such that the lower bound of the spectrum of $\Im\rho$ is sufficiently large, $\omega_n(\Lambda_n(\rho)) = \rho$.

Let now ρ be fixed in $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\Im m\rho > 0$ and $\Im m\Lambda_n(\rho) > 0$. Let ϕ be a positive linear functional on $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\phi(1) = 1$ (i.e. a state). Define $\varphi_\rho(\cdot) = \phi(\cdot)/\phi(\Im m\rho)$. It is linear and positive (well defined because $\Im m\rho \geq \frac{1}{\|(\Im m\rho)^{-1}\|}1$, so that $\phi(\Im m\rho) \geq \frac{1}{\|(\Im m\rho)^{-1}\|} > 0$). Define

$$f_\rho(z) = \varphi_\rho\left(\Lambda_n(\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho)\right), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Note that

$$f_\rho(z) = z + \varphi_\rho(\gamma + \Re e\rho)) + F(z)$$

where

$$F(z) = \frac{\phi\left[\sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau\left\{\left((\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}\right)^{-1}\right\} \alpha_v\right]}{\phi(\Im m\rho)}.$$

$F(z)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ and satisfies $\overline{F(z)} = F(\bar{z})$. Let $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$. We have

$$\Im m F(z)$$

$$= \frac{\phi\left[\sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau\left\{\Im m\left\{\left((\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}\right)^{-1}\right\}\right\} \alpha_v\right]}{\phi(\Im m\rho)}$$

where

$$\Im m\left\{\left((\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}\right)^{-1}\right\}$$

$$= -\Im m z \left((\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}\right)^{-1} (\Im m\rho \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}})$$

$$\times \left((\Re e\rho + \bar{z}\Im m\rho) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}\right)^{-1} < 0.$$

It follows by the complete positivity of the trace τ that

$$\mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau\left\{\Im m\left\{\left((\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}\right)^{-1}\right\}\right\} < 0.$$

Now, according to Remark 3, we can assume the α_v's invertible so that $\sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau\left\{\Im m\left\{\left((\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}\right)^{-1}\right\}\right\} \alpha_v < 0$ and then $\Im m F(z) < 0$. Thus for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, we have $\Im m z \Im m F(z) < 0$. Finally

$$\lim_{y \to +\infty} iyF(iy) = \varphi_\rho\left(\sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v (\Im m\rho)^{-1} \alpha_v\right) := c_\rho > 0.$$

Thus, by Akhiezer-Krein's Theorem ([1] page 93), there exists a probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$F(z) = c_\rho \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu(s)}{z - s}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Then

$$f_\rho(z) = z + \varphi_\rho(\gamma + \Re e\rho) + c_\rho \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu(s)}{z-s}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^+.$$

Thus $\Im m f_\rho(u+iv) = v\left(1 - c_\rho \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d\mu(s)}{(u-s)^2+v^2}\right)$. We observe that what's under paranthesis is strictly increasing in v. Since by hypothesis, we have $\Im\Lambda_n(\rho) > 0$ and thus $\Im m f_\rho(i) = \Im m\varphi_\rho\left(\Lambda_n(\Re e\rho + i\Im m\rho)\right) > 0$, we obtain immediately that $\Im m f_\rho(iv) > 0$ for all $v \geq 1$. This means that $\Im m\phi(\Lambda_n(\Re e\rho + iv\Im m\rho)) > 0$ for all $v \in [1, +\infty)$ and all states ϕ, so that

$$\Im m\Lambda_n(\Re e\rho + iv\Im m\rho) > 0, \text{ for all } v \geq 1. \tag{5.45}$$

Now it is clear that

$$\Omega = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^+, \Im m\Lambda_n(\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho) > 0\}$$

is an open set which contains $d = \{iv, v \geq 1\}$. Let Ω_d be the connected component of Ω which contains d. Note that Ω_d is an open set.

As we have shown at the beginning of our proof, for given $\rho, \Im\rho > 0$, there exists an $M > 0$ (possibly depending on ρ) such that $\omega_n(\Lambda_n(\Re e\rho + iv\Im m\rho)) = \Re e\rho + iv\Im m\rho$ for all $v > M$. By the identity principle for analytic functions, we immediately obtain that $\omega_n(\Lambda_n(\Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho)) = \Re e\rho + z\Im m\rho$ for all $z \in \Omega_d$ and in particular for $z = i$. The proof of Lemma 5.8 is complete. □

Applying Lemma 5.8 to $\rho = \lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v$ (using (5.8) and (5.43)) we obtain that since $\Im m\lambda' = \Im m\Lambda_n(\rho) > 0$ we have $\omega_n(\Lambda_n(\rho)) = \rho$ and according to (5.44)

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{G}_n\left(\lambda'\right) &= G_{\sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}\left(\omega_n(\Lambda_n(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v))\right) \\
&= G_{\sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}}\left(\lambda - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v G_n(\lambda)\alpha_v\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Corollary 5.6, we have

$$G_n(\lambda) - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda') - L_n(\lambda) = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \tag{5.46}$$

Now, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{G}_n(\lambda') - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) \\
&= \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left\{ r_n(\lambda') \left[(\lambda - \lambda') \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \right\} \\
&= \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left\{ r_n(\lambda) \left[(\lambda - \lambda') \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \right\} \\
&\quad + \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left\{ r_n(\lambda) \left[(\lambda - \lambda') \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \left[(\lambda - \lambda') \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \right\} \\
&\quad + \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left\{ r_n(\lambda') \left[(\lambda - \lambda') \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \left[(\lambda - \lambda') \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \left[(\lambda - \lambda') \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \right\} \\
&= \sum_{v=1}^{r} \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left\{ r_n(\lambda) \left[\alpha_v L_n(\lambda) \alpha_v \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \right\} \\
&\quad + \sum_{v,v'=1}^{r} \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left\{ r_n(\lambda) \left[\alpha_v L_n(\lambda) \alpha_v \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \left[\alpha_{v'} L_n(\lambda) \alpha_{v'} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} \right] r_n(\lambda) \right\} \\
&\quad + O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}})
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (5.38) and (8.6) in the last line. Hence we have

$$
\tilde{G}_n(\lambda') - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \tilde{G}_n'(\lambda) \cdot \alpha_v L_n(\lambda) \alpha_v - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{G}_n''(\lambda) \cdot \left(\sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v L_n(\lambda) \alpha_v, \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v L_n(\lambda) \alpha_v \right)
$$
$$
= O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \tag{5.47}
$$

(5.35) follows from (5.46) and (5.47) since

$$
\left\| G_n(\lambda) - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) + E_n(\lambda) \right\| \leq \left\| G_n(\lambda) - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda') - L_n(\lambda) \right\|
$$
$$
+ \left\| \tilde{G}_n(\lambda') - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) + \sum_{p=1}^{r} \tilde{G}_n'(\lambda) \cdot \alpha_v L_n(z) \alpha_v - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{G}_n''(\lambda) \cdot \left(\sum_{p=1}^{r} \alpha_v L_n(\lambda) \alpha_v, \sum_{p=1}^{r} \alpha_v L_n(\lambda) \alpha_v \right) \right\|.
$$

□

Remark 4. (5.34) *and* (8.6) *readily yield that* $E_n(\lambda) = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$. *Thus, we can deduce from (5.35) that*

$$
G_n(\lambda) - \tilde{G}_n(\lambda) = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}). \tag{5.48}
$$

Proposition 5.9. *For* $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$, *let* $g_n(z)$ *and* $\tilde{g}_n(z)$ *as defined in* (3.8) *and* (3.9) *respectively. We have*

$$
g_n(z) - \tilde{g}_n(z) + \tilde{E}_n(z) = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}), \tag{5.49}
$$

where $\tilde{E}_n(z)$ *is given by*

$$\tilde{E}_n(z) = \sum_{v=1}^{r} tr_m \left(\tilde{G}'_n(zI_m) \cdot \alpha_v \tilde{L}_n(z) \alpha_v \right) - \mathrm{tr}_m \, \tilde{L}_n(z) \tag{5.50}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{L}_n(z) = & \sum_{v=1}^{r} \\
& \Bigg\{ \sum_{i,l,p=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_4^{i,l,v} + \tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})}{4n^3} \tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)_{pl} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{ii} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{ll} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{ii} \alpha_v \left(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m) \right)_{lp} \\
& + \sum_{i,l,p=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} + \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v} \sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2} n^2 \sqrt{n}} \tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)_{pl} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{ii} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{li} \alpha_v \left(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m) \right)_{lp} \\
& + \sum_{i,l,p=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v} \sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2} n^2 \sqrt{n}} \tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)_{pl} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{ii} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{ll} \alpha_v \left(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m) \right)_{ip} \\
& + \sum_{i,l,p=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v} \sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2} n^2 \sqrt{n}} \tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)_{pl} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{il} \alpha_v(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m))_{ii} \alpha_v \left(\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m) \right)_{lp} \Bigg\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{Y}_n$ *and* $\tilde{G}_n$ *were defined in* (5.5) *and* (3.5) *respectively so that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m) &= \left((zI_m - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \tilde{G}_n(zI_m) \alpha_v) \otimes I_n - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)} \right)^{-1} \\
&= \left(\omega_n(zI_m) \otimes I_n - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)} \right)^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{G}_n(zI_m) &= \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left((zI_m - \gamma) \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v - \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)} \right)^{-1} \\
&= \mathrm{id}_m \otimes \tau \left(zI_m \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - s_n \right)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Im m z > 0$. Theorem 5.7 yields

$$g_n(z) - \tilde{g}_n(z) + \sum_{v=1}^{r} tr_m \tilde{G}'_n(zI_m) \cdot \alpha_v L_n(zI_m) \alpha_v - tr_m L_n(zI_m)$$

$$-\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr}_m \tilde{G}_n''(zI_m)\cdot\left(\sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v L_n(zI_m)\alpha_v, \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v L_n(zI_m)\alpha_v\right) = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \tag{5.51}$$

First note that, by Riesz-Fréchet's Theorem (and using ((8.6) and (5.34)), there exists $B_n^{(1)}(z)$ and $B_n^{(2)}(z)$ in $M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\|B_n^{(1)}(z)\|_2 \le |\Im m z|^{-2}\left(\sum_{v=1}^r \|\alpha_v\|^2\right) = O(1),$$

$$\|B_n^{(2)}(z)\|_2 = O(1/\sqrt{n}), \tag{5.52}$$

and

$$\sum_{v=1}^r \operatorname{tr}_m \tilde{G}_n'(zI_m)\cdot\alpha_v L_n(zI_m)\alpha_v = \operatorname{Tr}_m\left[B_n^{(1)}(z)L_n(zI_m)\right],$$

$$\operatorname{tr}_m \tilde{G}_n''(zI_m)\cdot\left(\sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v L_n(zI_m)\alpha_v, \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v L_n(zI_m)\alpha_v\right) = \operatorname{Tr}_m\left[B_n^{(2)}(z)L_n(zI_m)\right]. \tag{5.53}$$

Recall that for $\lambda \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\Im m\lambda > 0$,

$$L_n(\lambda) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{p=1}^n \left[Y_n(\lambda)\Psi(\lambda)\right]_{pp},$$

where Ψ is defined in (5.10). First, note that according to (5.16), we have (setting $c_{l,i,v} = \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} - \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}}$)

$$\operatorname{Tr}_m\left[B_n^{(2)}(z)L_n(zI_m)\right]$$

$$= \sum_{v=1}^r \sum_{i,l=1}^n \frac{c_{l,i,v}}{n^2\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\operatorname{Tr}_m\left\{\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ll}\alpha_v\left(R_n(zI_m)(B_n^{(2)}(z)\otimes I_n)Y_n(zI_m)\right)_{il}\right\}$$
$$+O(\tfrac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}).$$

Moreover, there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\left\|\sum_{v=1}^r \sum_{i,l=1}^n \frac{c_{l,i,v}}{n^2\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\operatorname{Tr}_m\left\{\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ll}\alpha_v\left(R_n(zI_m)(B_n^{(2)}(z)\otimes I_n)Y_n(zI_m)\right)_{il}\right\}\right\|$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{Cm|\Im z|^{-2}}{n^2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \left\| \Big(R_n(zI_m)(B_n^{(2)}(z)\otimes I_n)Y_n(zI_m) \Big)_{il} \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{Cm|\Im z|^{-2}}{n\sqrt{n}} \left\{ \sum_{i,l=1}^{n} \left\| \Big(R_n(zI_m)(B_n^{(2)}(z)\otimes I_n)Y_n(zI_m) \Big)_{il} \right\|^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{Cm\sqrt{m}|\Im z|^{-2}}{n} \left\| R_n(zI_m)(B_n^{(2)}(z)\otimes I_n)Y_n(zI_m) \right\| \\
&= O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}),
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (8.7), (5.6), (5.52) and (8.1). Hence

$$
\mathrm{Tr}_m \left[B_n^{(2)}(z) L_n(zI_m) \right] = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \tag{5.54}
$$

(5.51), (5.53) and (5.54) yield

$$
g_n(z) - \tilde{g}_n(z) + \sum_{v=1}^{r} tr_m \tilde{G}_n'(zI_m) \cdot \alpha_v L_n(zI_m)\alpha_v - tr_m L_n(zI_m) = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \tag{5.55}
$$

Thus, in the following we will consider $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{p=1}^{n} \mathrm{tr}_m\, B_n(\lambda)\,[Y_n(\lambda)T(\lambda)]_{pp}$ for each term $T(\lambda)$ involving in (5.10) and any $m\times m$ matrix $B_n(\lambda) = O(1)$. We set $\mathcal{B}(\lambda) = B_n(\lambda)\otimes I_n$.
First, for any fixed $v \in \{1,\ldots,r\}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left| \tfrac{1}{n}\sum_{p,l=1}^{n} \mathrm{tr}_m\, B_n(\lambda)(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl} \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_v[H_n(\lambda) - \mathbb{E}(H_n(\lambda))]\alpha_v[R_n(\lambda)]_{lp}\right] \right| \\
&= |\mathrm{tr}_m\, \mathbb{E}\left[\alpha_v[H_n(\lambda) - \mathbb{E}(H_n(\lambda))]\alpha_v id\otimes tr_n[R_n(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)Y_n(\lambda)]\right]| \\
&= |\mathrm{tr}_m\, \mathbb{E}\left\{\alpha_v[H_n(\lambda) - \mathbb{E}(H_n(\lambda))]\alpha_v \right. \\
&\qquad \left. \times [id\otimes tr_n[R_n(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)Y_n(\lambda)] - \mathbb{E}(id\otimes tr_n[R_n(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)Y_n(\lambda)])]\right\}| \\
&\leq \frac{\|B_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^2 Cm}{n^2} \|(Im(\lambda))^{-1}\|^5 \\
&= O(1/n^2).
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used Cauchy Schwarz's inequality, (8.7), (5.6) and Lemma 5.1 in the last line.
We also have

$$
\left\| \sum_{i,p,l=1}^{n} \frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v} + \tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{n^2\sqrt{n}} \mathrm{tr}_m\, B_n(\lambda)(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl} \mathbb{E}\{\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ip}\} \right\|
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{n^2\sqrt{n}}\left\|\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\{\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)Y_n(\lambda))_{il}\}\right\| \\
&\leq \frac{C\|B_n(\lambda)\|}{n^2\sqrt{n}}\|\alpha_v\|^3\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^2\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\|(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^2 \\
&= O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}})
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (8.7), (5.6) and (8.8).
Now, let us investigate the terms corresponding to the the $M^{(4)}(v,i,l,j)$'s in (5.10). We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{1}{4n^3}\sum_{i,p,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\,B_n(\lambda)(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ip}\right| \\
&= \left|\frac{1}{4n^3}\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\,\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v\left(R_n(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)Y_n(\lambda)\right)_{il}\right| \\
&\leq \frac{C\|B_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4}{n^3}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^3\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\|(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{C\|B_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4 m}{n^2}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^5 = O(1/n^2)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (8.7), (5.6) and (8.8). Similarly the terms corresponding to (5.11) and (5.13) can be bounded by $\frac{Cm\|B_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4}{n^2}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^5$. We also have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left|\frac{1}{4n^3}\sum_{i,p,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\,B_n(\lambda)(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{lp}\right| \\
&= \frac{1}{4n^3}\left|\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\,\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)Y_n(\lambda))_{ll}\right| \\
&\leq \frac{C\|B_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4}{n^3}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^3\left\{\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\|R_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}\left\{\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\|R_n(\lambda))_{li}\|^2\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{mC\|B_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4}{n^2}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^5 = O(1/n^2).
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (8.7), (5.6) and (8.1). Now,

$$\left|\tfrac{1}{4n^3}\sum_{i,p,l=1}^{n}(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde\kappa_4^{i,l,v})\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\, B_n(\lambda)(Y_n(\lambda))_{pl}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(\lambda))_{ip}\right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{C}{n^3}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^2\|\alpha_v\|^4\left\{\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\|(R_n(\lambda)\mathcal{B}(\lambda)Y_n(\lambda))_{il}\|^2\right\}^{\frac12}\left\{\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}\|R_n(\lambda))_{li}\|^2\right\}^{\frac12}\\
&\leq \frac{Cm\|B_n(\lambda)\|\|\alpha_v\|^4}{n^2}\left\|(\Im m\lambda)^{-1}\right\|^5=O(1/n^2)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (8.7), (5.6) and (8.1). Similarly the terms in (5.12) and (5.14) lead to a $O(1/n^2)$.

Since moreover each term in (5.10) corresponding to the $M^{(3)}(v,i,i,j)$, $M^{(4)}(v,i,i,j)$ and $M^{(5)}(v,i,l,j)$ leads obviously to a term which is a $O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}})$, it readily follows from (5.55) that

$$g_n(z)-\tilde g_n(z)+\sum_{v=1}^{r}tr_m\tilde G_n'(zI_m)\cdot\alpha_v\hat L_n(zI_m)\alpha_v-tr_m\hat L_n(zI_m)=O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}),$$

where

$$\hat L_n(zI_m)=\textstyle\sum_{v=1}^{r}\sum_{i,p,l=1}^{n}$$

$$\left\{\frac{(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde\kappa_4^{i,l,v})}{4n^3}(Y_n(zI_m))_{pl}\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left\{(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{lp}\right\}.\right.$$

$$+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}+\tilde\kappa_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}(Y_n(zI_m))_{pl}\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left\{(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{li}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{lp}\right\}$$

$$+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde\kappa_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}(Y_n(zI_m))_{pl}\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left\{(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ip}\right\}$$

$$\left.+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde\kappa_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}(Y_n(zI_m))_{pl}\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left\{(R_n(zI_m))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{lp}\right\}\right\}$$

For any $m\times m$ deterministic matrix $B_n(z)$,

$$\mathrm{tr}_m\, B_n(z)\hat L_n(zI_m)=\textstyle\sum_{v=1}^{r}\sum_{i,l=1}^{n}$$

$$\left\{\frac{(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde\kappa_4^{i,l,v})}{4n^3}\mathbb{E}\left\{\mathrm{tr}_m\,\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ll}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m))_{ll}\right\}\right.$$

$$+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\left\{\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{li}\alpha_v\left(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m)\right)_{ll}\right\}$$

$$+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\left\{\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ll}\alpha_v\left(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m)\right)_{il}\right\}$$

$$+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}\mathbb{E}\,\mathrm{tr}_m\left\{\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{il}\alpha_v(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\alpha_v\left(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m)\right)_{ll}\right\}\Bigg\}$$

Hence Lemma 5.1 readily yields that

$$\mathrm{tr}_m\, B_n\hat{L}_n(zI_m)+O(\tfrac{1}{n\sqrt{n}})=\sum_{v=1}^r\sum_{i,l=1}^n\mathrm{tr}_m$$

$$\Bigg\{\frac{(\kappa_4^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_4^{i,l,v})}{4n^3}\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\right]\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{ll}\right]\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\right]\alpha_v[\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m))_{ll}\right]$$

$$+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}+\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\right]\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{li}\right]\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m))_{ll}\right]$$

$$+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\right]\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{ll}\right]\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m))_{il}\right]$$

$$+\frac{(\kappa_3^{i,l,v}-\tilde{\kappa}_3^{i,l,v}\sqrt{-1})}{2\sqrt{2}n^2\sqrt{n}}\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{il}\right]\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m))_{ii}\right]\alpha_v\mathbb{E}\left[(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m))_{ll}\right]\Bigg\}.$$

Note that, with Y_n and $\tilde{Y}_n$ defined in (5.4) and (5.5), we have

$$Y_n(zI_m)-\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)=\sum_{v=1}^r Y_n(zI_m)\left[\alpha_v(G_n(zI_m)-\tilde{G}_n(zI_m))\alpha_v\otimes I_n\right]\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)$$

so that, using (5.48), (5.6) and (5.7), we can deduce that

$$\|Y_n(zI_m)-\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)\|=O(1/\sqrt{n}). \tag{5.56}$$

Now, (5.29) and (5.56) obviously yield that, up to a $0(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}})$ correction term, one can replace any $R_n(zI_m)$ and $Y_n(zI_m)$ by $\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)$ in any term in the sum corresponding to the fourth cumulants. Now, using (8.1), (5.29) and (5.56) also yield that, up to a $0(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}})$ correction term, for any $p=1,\ldots,n$, one can replace $(R_n(zI_m))$ and $(Y_n(zI_m))$ by $\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)$ in any diagonal term $(R_n(zI_m))_{pp}$ or $(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)Y_n(zI_m))_{pp}$ in the sums corresponding to the third cumulants.

Finally, assume that for $i=1,2$, $Q^{(i)}=\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)$ or $\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}(z)\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)$.

Let us consider any $Q^{(3)} = \sum_{i,l=1}^n Q_{il}^{(3)} \otimes E_{il}$. It is clear that if there exists some polynomial Q with nonnegative coefficients such that for any $i,l \in \{1,\dots,n\}^2$, $\|Q_{il}^{(3)}\| \leq \frac{Q(|\Im z|^{-1})}{n}$, then

$$\frac{1}{n^2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i,l=1}^n \|Q_{ii}^{(1)}\| \|Q_{ll}^{(2)}\| \|Q_{il}^{(3)}\| = O(1/n\sqrt{n}).$$

Now, if $\|Q^{(3)}\| = O(1/\sqrt{n})$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n^2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i,l=1}^n \|Q_{ii}^{(1)}\| \|Q_{ll}^{(2)}\| \|Q_{il}^{(3)}\|$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} |(\Im mz)^{-1}|^q \left(\sum_{i,l=1}^n \|Q_{il}^{(3)}\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{m}}{n} |(\Im mz)^{-1}|^q \|Q^{(3)}\| = O(1/n\sqrt{n})$$

for some $q \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, where we used (8.1).
It is then clear that using Corollary 5.5, (5.28) and (5.56), up to a $0(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}})$ correction term, for any $(i,l) \in \{1,\dots,n\}^2$, one can replace $R_n(zI_m)$ and $Y_n(zI_m)$ by $\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)$ in any non-diagonal term $(R_n(zI_m))_{il}$, $(R_n(zI_m))_{li}$ or $(R_n(zI_m)\mathcal{B}Y_n)_{il}$ in the sums corresponding to the third cumulants. Hence (5.49) is proved for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Im z > 0$.
Set $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots \alpha_r)$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t)$. Let us denote for a while $g_n = g_n^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$, $\tilde{g}_n = \tilde{g}_n^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ and $\tilde{E}_n = \tilde{E}_n^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$. Note that we have similarly for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Im mz > 0$,

$$g_n^{-\alpha,-\beta,-\gamma}(z) - \tilde{g}_n^{-\alpha,-\beta,-\gamma}(z) + \tilde{E}_n^{-\alpha,-\beta,-\gamma}(z) = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \tag{5.57}$$

Thus, since $g_n^{-\alpha,-\beta,-\gamma}(z) = -g_n^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(-z)$, $\tilde{g}_n^{-\alpha,-\beta,-\gamma}(z) = -\tilde{g}_n^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(-z)$ and $\tilde{E}_n^{-\alpha,-\beta,-\gamma}(z) = -\tilde{E}_n^{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(-z)$, it readily follows that (5.49) is also valid for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Im mz < 0$. □

Lemma 5.10. *For any fixed large n, $\tilde{E}_n$ defined in Proposition 5.9 is the Stieltjes transform of a compactly supported distribution ∇_n on $\mathbb{R}$ whose support is included in the spectrum of $s_n = \gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}$ and such that $\nabla_n(1) = 0$.*

The proof relies on the following characterization already used in [29].

Theorem 5.11. *[33]*

- *Let Λ be a distribution on $\mathbb{R}$ with compact support. Define the Stieltjes transform of Λ, $l : \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{C}$ by*

$$l(z) = \Lambda\left(\frac{1}{z-x}\right).$$

Then l is analytic on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ and has an analytic continuation to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\Lambda)$. Moreover

(c_1) $l(z) \to 0$ as $|z| \to \infty$,

(c_2) there exists a constant $C > 0$, an integer $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ containing $\operatorname{supp}(\Lambda)$, such that for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$,

$$|l(z)| \leq C \max\{\operatorname{dist}(z, K)^{-q}, 1\},$$

(c_3) for any $\phi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ with compact support

$$\Lambda(\phi) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \lim_{y \to 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi(x)[l(x+iy) - l(x-iy)]dx.$$

- *Conversely, if K is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$ and if $l : \mathbb{C} \setminus K \to \mathbb{C}$ is an analytic function satisfying (c_1) and (c_2) above, then l is the Stieltjes transform of a compactly supported distribution Λ on $\mathbb{R}$. Moreover,* $\operatorname{supp}(\Lambda)$ *is exactly the set of singular points of l in K.*

Lemma 5.12. *The singular points of $\tilde{E}_N$ defined in* (5.50) *are included in the spectrum of $s_n = \gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}$.*

Proof. Let us start by noting that, as it follows from the definition (5.50) of $\tilde{E}_N$, it is enough to show that $\omega_n(zI_m) \otimes I_n - \sum_{s=1}^{t} \beta_s \otimes A_n^{(s)} \in GL_{nm}(\mathbb{C})$ (the group of invertible $nm \times nm$ complex matrices) for any z in the domain of definition of $\mathbb{C} \ni z \mapsto \omega_n(zI_m) \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$.

Assume towards contradiction that $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ is in the domain of $\omega_n(\cdot I_m)$, and yet $\omega_n(x_0 I_m) \otimes I_n - \sum_{s=1}^{t} \beta_s \otimes A_n^{(s)}$ is not invertible. First, observe that a point x_0 with this property must be isolated and real. Indeed, otherwise the zeros of the analytic map $\mathbb{C} \ni z \mapsto \det\left(\omega_n(zI_m) \otimes I_n - \sum_{s=1}^{t} \beta_s \otimes A_n^{(s)}\right) \in \mathbb{C}$ would have x_0 as a cluster point in the interior of its domain (which coincides with the domain of $\omega_n(\cdot I_m)$), and thus it would be identically equal to zero. However, $\omega_n(zI_m) \otimes I_n - \sum_{s=1}^{t} \beta_s \otimes A_n^{(s)}$ is invertible when

$\Im mz \neq 0$, providing us with a contradiction. Consider now such an isolated x_0. Recall

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{g}_n(z) &= (\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \tau)\left(\left(\omega_n(zI_m)\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - \sum_{s=1}^{t}\beta_s \otimes a_n^{(s)}\right)^{-1}\right)\\ &= (\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n)\left(\left(\omega_n(zI_m)\otimes I_n - \sum_{s=1}^{t}\beta_s \otimes A_n^{(s)}\right)^{-1}\right),\end{aligned}$$

from before (the second equality is justified by the hypothesis that the distribution of $(A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)})$ with respect to tr_n coincides with the distribution of $(a_n^{(1)},\ldots,a_n^{(t)})$ with respect to τ). We have seen that $\tilde{g}_n$ is defined exactly on the complement of the spectrum of s_n. Thus, it is enough to show that, given an analytic function $f\colon \mathbb{C}^+ \to H^-(M_p(\mathbb{C})) = \{b \in M_p(\mathbb{C}), \Im mb < 0\}$, and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ with the property that there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that f extends analytically through $(x_0-\epsilon, x_0)\cup(x_0, x_0+\epsilon)$ with self-adjoint values, then either both or none of f and $\mathrm{tr}_p \circ f$ extend analytically to x_0. We shall then apply this to $p = mn$ and $f(z) = \left(\omega_n(zI_m)\otimes I_n - \sum_{s=1}^{t}\beta_s \otimes A_n^{(s)}\right)^{-1}$ to conclude.

It is clear that if f extends analytically through x_0, then so does $\mathrm{tr}_p \circ f$. Assume towards contradiction that $\mathrm{tr}_p \circ f$ extends analytically through x_0, but f does not. Consider an arbitrary system $\{e_1,\ldots,e_p\}$ of minimal mutually orthogonal projections in $M_p(\mathbb{C})$. It is clear that $z \mapsto e_j f(z) e_j \in e_j M_p(\mathbb{C}) e_j \simeq \mathbb{C}$ is analytic wherever f is. Moreover, $\Im m e_j f(z) e_j \leq 0$ whenever $z \in \mathbb{C}^+$, and $e_j f(z) e_j \in \mathbb{R}$ whenever $f(z)$ is self-adjoint. If $z \mapsto e_j f(z) e_j$ extends analytically through x_0 for any $e_j \in \{e_1,\ldots,e_p\}$ and all systems $\{e_1,\ldots,e_p\}$, then $z \mapsto \varphi(f(z))$ extends analytically through x_0 for all linear functionals $\varphi\colon M_p(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathbb{C}$. This implies that f itself is analytic around x_0. On the other hand, if there exists a system $\{e_1,\ldots,e_p\}$ of minimal mutually orthogonal projections in $M_p(\mathbb{C})$ which contains an e_j such that $z \mapsto e_j f(z) e_j$ does not extend analytically through x_0, then, as $z \mapsto e_j f(z) e_j$ does extend analytically with real values through $(x_0-\epsilon, x_0)\cup(x_0, x_0+\epsilon)$ and maps $\mathbb{C}^+$ into $\mathbb{C}^-\cup\mathbb{R}$, it follows that x_0 is a simple pole of $z \mapsto e_j f(z) e_j$ and $\lim_{y\to 0} iy e_j f(x_0+iy) e_j \in (0,+\infty)$ by the Julia-Carathéodory Theorem applied to $1/e_j f(z) e_j$ (see (2) Theorem 2.1 in [11]). But then $\mathrm{tr}_p(f(z)) = \sum_{k=1}^{p} e_k f(z) e_k$, so that

$$\lim_{y\to 0} iy\,\mathrm{tr}_p(f(x_0+iy)) = \sum_{k=1}^{p}\lim_{y\to 0} iy e_k f(x_0+iy) e_k > 0,$$

which contradicts the assumption that $\mathrm{tr}_p \circ f$ extends analytically through x_0. □

Now, we are going to show that for any fixed large n, $\tilde{E}_n$ satisfies (c_1) and (c_2) of Theorem 5.11.
First note that there exists a polynomial Q in two variables with positive coefficients such that

$$|\tilde{E}_n(z)| \leq \|\tilde{Y}(zI_m))\|^4 Q(\|\tilde{Y}(zI_m))\|, \|r_n(zI_m)\|). \tag{5.58}$$

Let $C > 0$ be such that, for all n, $\mathrm{sp}(\sum_{s=1}^t \beta_s \otimes A_n^{(s)}) \subset [-C; C]$ and $\mathrm{sp}(\gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}) \subset [-C; C]$.
Let $d > C + \sqrt{r} \max_{v=1}^r \|\alpha_v\|$. For any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z| > \|\gamma\| + d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\gamma + \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v \tilde{G}_n(zI_m)\alpha_v\| &\leq \|\gamma\| + \frac{r \max_{v=1}^r \|\alpha_v\|^2}{|z| - C} \\
&\leq \|\gamma\| + \frac{r \max_{v=1}^r \|\alpha_v\|^2}{d - C} \\
&< \|\gamma\| + \frac{(d-C)^2}{d-C} \\
&= \|\gamma\| + d - C
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|\gamma + \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v \tilde{G}_n(zI_m)\alpha_v + \sum_{u=1}^t \beta_u \otimes A_n^{(u)}\| \leq \|\gamma\| + d$$

so that we get that for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|z| > \|\gamma\| + d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\tilde{Y}_n(zI_m)\| &= \|((zI_m - \gamma - \sum_{v=1}^r \alpha_v \tilde{G}_n(zI_m)\alpha_v) \otimes I_n - \sum_{s=1}^t \beta_s \otimes A_n^{(s)})^{-1}\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{|z| - \|\gamma\| - d}.
\end{aligned}$$

We get readily from (5.58) that, for $|z| > \|\gamma\| + d$,

$$|\tilde{E}_n(z)| \leq \frac{1}{(|z| - \|\gamma\| - d)^4} Q\left(\frac{1}{(|z| - \|\gamma\| - d)}, \frac{1}{(|z| - C)}\right). \tag{5.59}$$

Then, it is clear than $|\tilde{E}_n(z)| \to 0$ when $|z| \to +\infty$ and (c_1) is satisfied.
Now we are going to prove (c_2) using the approach of [29](Lemma 5.5).

Denote by $\mathcal{E}_n$ the convex envelope of the spectrum of $s_n = \gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}$ and define

$$K_n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}; \mathrm{dist}(x, \mathcal{E}_n) \leq 1\}$$

and

$$D_n = \{z \in \mathbb{C}; 0 < \mathrm{dist}(z, K_n) \leq 1\}.$$

- Let $z \in D_n \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R})$ with $\Re e(z) \in K_n$. We have $\mathrm{dist}(z, K_n) = |\Im m z| \leq 1$. We have from (5.58), (8.6) and (5.7) that

$$|\tilde{E}_n(z)| \leq |\Im m z|^{-4} Q\left(|\Im m z|^{-1}, |\Im m z|^{-1}\right).$$

  Noticing that $1 \leq |\Im m z|^{-1}$, we easily deduce that there exists some constant C_0 and some number $q_0 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that for any $z \in D_n \cap \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ with $\Re e(z) \in K_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\tilde{E}_n(z)| &\leq C_0 |\Im m z|^{-q_0} \\ &\leq C_0 \mathrm{dist}(z, K_n)^{-q_0} \\ &\leq C_0 \max(\mathrm{dist}(z, K_n)^{-q_0}; 1) \end{aligned}$$

- Let $z \in D_n \cap (\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R})$ with $\Re e(z) \notin K_n$. Then $\mathrm{dist}(z, \mathrm{sp}(s_n)) \geq 1$. Since $\tilde{E}_n$ is bounded on compact subsets of $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathrm{sp}(\gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{s=1}^{t} \beta_s \otimes a_n^{(s)})$, we easily deduce that there exists some constant $C_1(n)$ such that for any $z \in D_n$ with $\Re e(z) \notin K_n$,

$$|\tilde{E}_n(z)| \leq C_1(n) \leq C_1(n) \max(\mathrm{dist}(z, K_n)^{-q_0}; 1).$$

- Since $|\tilde{E}_n(z)| \to 0$ when $|z| \to +\infty$, $\tilde{E}_n$ is bounded on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{D_n}$. Thus, there exists some constant $C_2(n)$ such that for any $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{D_n}$,

$$|\tilde{E}_n(z)| \leq C_2(n) = C_2(n) \max(\mathrm{dist}(z, K_n)^{-q_0}; 1).$$

Hence (c_2) is satisfied with $C(n) = \max(C_0, C_1(n), C_2(n))$ and $l = q_0$. Thus, Theorem 5.11 implies that for any fixed large n, $\tilde{E}_n$ defined in Proposition 5.9 is the Stieltjes transform of a compactly supported distribution ∇_n on $\mathbb{R}$ whose support is included in the spectrum of $s_n = \gamma \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} + \sum_{v=1}^{r} \alpha_v \otimes x_v + \sum_{u=1}^{t} \beta_u \otimes a_n^{(u)}$. Following the proof of Lemma 5.6 in [29] and using (5.59), one can show that $\nabla_n(1) = 0$. The proof of Lemma 5.10 is complete. □

5.2 From Stietjes transform estimates to spectra.

(1.8) can be deduced from (1.9) by an approach inspired by [20] and [29] as follows.
Using the inverse Stieltjes tranform, we get respectively that, for any φ_n in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ with compact support,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n(\varphi_n(S_n))] - \mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \tau(\varphi_n(s_n)) + \nabla_n(\varphi_n)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{y\to 0^+} \Im m \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_n(x)\epsilon_n(x+iy)dx,$$

where $\epsilon_n(z) = \tilde{g}_n(z) - g_n(z) - \tilde{E}_n(z)$ satisfies, according to Proposition 5.9, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$,

$$|\epsilon_n(z)| \leq \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}} P(|\Im m z|^{-1}).$$

We refer the reader to the Appendix of [14] where it is proved using the ideas of [20] that if h is an analytic function on $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{R}$ which satisfies

$$|h(z)| \leq P(|\Im m z|^{-1})$$

for some polynomial P with nonnegative coefficients and degree k, then there exists a polynomial Q such that

$$\limsup_{y\to 0^+} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_n(x)h(x+iy)dx \right|$$

$$\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^{+\infty} |(1+D)^{k+1}\varphi_n(x)| Q(t)\exp(-t)dtdx$$

where D stands for the derivative operator. Hence, if there exists $K > 0$ such that, for all large n, the support of φ_n is included in $[-K,K]$ and $\sup_n \sup_{x\in[-K,K]} |D^p\varphi_n(x)| = C_p < \infty$ for any $p \leq k+1$, dealing with $h(z) = n\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n(z)$, we deduce that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all large n,

$$\limsup_{y\to 0^+} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_n(x)\epsilon_n(x+iy)dx \right| \leq \frac{C}{n\sqrt{n}}$$

and then

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n(\varphi_n(S_n))] - \mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \tau(\varphi_n(s_n)) + \nabla_n(\varphi_n) = O(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \qquad (5.60)$$

Let $\rho \geq 0$ be in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$ such that its support is included in $[-1;1]$ and $\int \rho(x)dx = 1$. Let $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Define for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\rho_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(x) = \frac{2}{\epsilon}\rho(\frac{2x}{\epsilon}).$$

Set

$$K_n(\epsilon) = \{x, \mathrm{dist}(x, \mathrm{sp}(s_n)) \leq \epsilon\}$$

and define for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$f_n(\epsilon)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbf{1}_{K_n(\epsilon)}(y)\rho_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(x-y)dy.$$

The function $f_n(\epsilon)$ is in $\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$, $f_n(\epsilon) \equiv 1$ on $K_n(\frac{\epsilon}{2})$; its support is included in $K_n(2\epsilon)$. Since there exists K such that, for all large n, the spectrum of s_n is included in $[-K;K]$, for all large n the support of $f_n(\epsilon)$ is included in $[-K-2;K+2]$ and for any $p > 0$,

$$\sup_{x\in[-K-2;K+2]} |D^p f_n(\epsilon)(x)| \leq \sup_{x\in[-K-2;K+2]} \int_{-K-1}^{K+1} |D^p \rho_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(x-y)|dy \leq C_p(\epsilon).$$

Thus, according to (5.60),

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n(f_n(\epsilon)(S_n))] - \mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \tau f_n(\epsilon)(s_n) + \nabla_n(f_n(\epsilon)) = O_\epsilon(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}) \quad (5.61)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n((f_n'(\epsilon))^2(S_n))] - \mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \tau(f_n'(\epsilon)(s_n))^2 + \nabla_n((f_n'(\epsilon))^2) = O_\epsilon(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \quad (5.62)$$

According to Lemma 5.10, we have $\nabla_n(1) = 0$. Then, the function $\psi_n(\epsilon) \equiv 1 - f_n(\epsilon)$ also satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n(\psi_n(\epsilon)(S_n))] - \mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \tau\left(\psi_n(\epsilon)(s_n)\right) + \nabla_n(\psi_n(\epsilon)) = O_\epsilon(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}). \quad (5.63)$$

Moreover, since $\psi_n'(\epsilon) = -f_n'(\epsilon)$, it comes readily from (5.62) that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}_n((\psi_n'(\epsilon))^2(S_n))] - \mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \tau(\psi_n'(\epsilon)(s_n))^2 + \nabla_n((\psi_n'(\epsilon))^2) = O_\epsilon(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}).$$

Now, since $\psi_n(\epsilon) \equiv 0$ on the spectrum of s_n, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n(\psi_n(\epsilon)(S_n))] = O_\epsilon\left(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\right) \quad (5.64)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n((\psi_n'(\epsilon))^2(S_n))] = O_\epsilon\left(\frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{5.65}$$

By Lemma 8.5 (sticking to the proof of Proposition 4.7 in [20] with $\varphi = f_n(\epsilon)$), we have

$$\mathbf{V}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n(\psi_n(\epsilon)(S_n))] \leq \frac{C}{n^2}\mathbb{E}\left[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n\{(\psi_n'(\epsilon)(S_n))^2\}\right].$$

Hence, using (5.65), one can deduce that

$$\mathbf{V}[\mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n(\psi_n(\epsilon)(S_n))] = O_\epsilon\left(\frac{1}{n^3\sqrt{n}}\right). \tag{5.66}$$

Fix $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{4}$. Set

$$Z_{n,\epsilon} := \mathrm{tr}_m \otimes \mathrm{tr}_n(\psi_n(\epsilon)(S_n))$$

and

$$\Omega_{n,\epsilon} = \{|Z_{n,\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}\,(Z_{n,\epsilon})| > n^{-(1+\delta)}\}.$$

Hence, using (5.66), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{n,\epsilon}) \leq n^{2+2\delta}\mathbf{V}\{Z_{n,\epsilon}\} = O_\epsilon\left(\frac{1}{n^{1+\frac{1}{2}-2\delta}}\right).$$

By Borel-Cantelli lemma, we deduce that, almost surely for all large n,

$$|Z_{n,\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}\,(Z_{n,\epsilon})| \leq n^{-(1+\delta)}. \tag{5.67}$$

From (5.64) and (5.67), we deduce that there exists some constant C_ϵ such that, almost surely for all large n,

$$|Z_{n,\epsilon}| \leq n^{-1}\left(n^{-\delta} + C_\epsilon n^{-1/2}\right).$$

Since $\psi_n(\epsilon) \geq \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}\setminus K_n(2\epsilon)}$, it readily follows that, almost surely for all large n, the number of eigenvalues of S_n which are in $\mathbb{R} \setminus K_n(2\epsilon)$ is lower than $m\left(n^{-\delta} + C_\epsilon n^{-1/2}\right)$ and thus obviously, almost surely for all large n, the number of eigenvalues of S_n which are in $\mathbb{R} \setminus K_n(2\epsilon)$ has to be equal to zero. Thus we have the following

Theorem 5.13. *Let $\epsilon > 0$. Almost surely for all large n, the spectrum of S_n is included in $K_n(\epsilon) = \{x, \mathrm{dist}(x, \mathrm{sp}(s_n)) \leq \epsilon\}$.*

Since the above theorem holds for any $m \times m$ Hermitian matrices γ, $\{\alpha_v\}_{v=1,\ldots,r}$, $\{\beta_s\}_{s=1,\ldots,t}$, the proof of Lemma 1.3 is complete.

6 Proof of Theorem 1.1

6.1 Linearization

Linearization procedures are by no means unique, and no agreed upon definition of what a linearization is exists in the literature. We use the procedure introduced in [2, Proposition 3], which has several advantages, to be described below.

It is shown in [2] that, given a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$, there exist $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and matrices $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_k, \gamma \in M_m(\mathbb{C})$ such that $(z - P(X_1, \ldots, X_k))^{-1} = \left[\left(z\hat{E}_{11} \otimes 1 - \gamma \otimes 1 - \sum_{j=1}^k \zeta_j \otimes X_j\right)^{-1}\right]_{11}$. Moreover, if $P = P^*$, then γ and $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_k$ can be chosen to be self-adjoint. We denote $L_P = \gamma \otimes 1 + \sum_{j=1}^k \zeta_j \otimes X_j \in M_m(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$ and call it a *linearization* of P. The size m and the matrix coefficients $\gamma, \zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_k$ aren't unique. Following [12] (see also [27]), we provide a very brief outline of a recursive construction for a linearization L_P such that

$$L_P := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u \\ v & Q \end{pmatrix} \in M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$$

where

1. $m \in \mathbb{N}$,
2. $Q \in M_{m-1}(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$ is invertible,
3. u is a row vector and v is a column vector, both of size $m-1$ with entries in $\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$,
4. the polynomial entries in Q, u and v all have degree ≤ 1,
5. $$P = -uQ^{-1}v,$$
6. and moreover, if P is self-adjoint, L_P is self-adjoint.

Thus, to linearize a monomial $P = X_{i_1}X_{i_2}X_{i_3}\cdots X_{i_{k-1}}X_{i_l}$, write

$$L_P = -\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & X_{i_1} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & X_{i_2} & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & X_{i_3} & -1 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & X_{i_{l-1}} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ X_{i_l} & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

with the obvious adaptations if $l = 1, 2$. The $(l-1)\times(l-1)$ lower right corner of the above matrix is invertible in the algebra $M_{l-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$ and its inverse has as entries polynomials of degree up to $l-1$ (again with the obvious modifications when $l \leq 2$). The constant term in the inverse's formula is simply the matrix having -1 on its second diagonal, and its spectrum included in $\{-1, 1\}$. If the matrices $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & u_j \\ v_j & Q_j \end{bmatrix}$, with $u_j \in M_{1\times n_j}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle), v_j \in M_{n_j\times 1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle), Q_j \in M_{n_j}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$ are linearizations for P_j, $j = 1, 2$, then

$$L_{P_1+P_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u_1 & u_2 \\ v_1 & Q_1 & 0 \\ v_2 & 0 & Q_2 \end{bmatrix} \in M_{n_1+n_2+1}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle).$$

In particular, we have again that $\begin{bmatrix} Q_1 & 0 \\ 0 & Q_2 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \in M_{n_1+n_2}(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$, with entries of degrees no more $\max\{n_1, n_2\}$. Again, its constant term has all its eigenvalues of absolute value equal to one. The above construction does not necessarily provide a self-adjoint L_P, even if $P = P^*$. However, any self-adjoint polynomial P is written as a sum $P = P_0 + P_0^*$ for some other polynomial P_0 (self-adjoint or not) of the same degree. Let $L_{P_0} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u_0 \\ v_0 & Q_0 \end{bmatrix}$. To insure that the linearization we obtain is self-adjoint, we write

$$L_P = L_{P_0+P_0^*} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u_0 & v_0^* \\ u_0^* & 0 & Q_0^* \\ v_0 & Q_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which satisfies $L_P = L_P^*$ and linearizes P. Moreover, since $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_0^* \\ Q_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_0^{-1} \\ (Q_0^*)^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & Q_0^* \\ Q_0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^{-1}$ has entries which are polynomials in $X_1, \ldots, X_k$, all of them of degree majorized by the degree of P, and its constant term is a complex matrix having spectrum included in the unit circle of the complex plane. These remarks, which the reader can find in [27], will be most useful in our analysis below.

It follows from the above that if $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ are elements in some complex algebra $\mathcal{R}$ with unit 1, then $z1 - P(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ is invertible in $\mathcal{R}$ if and only if $z\hat{E}_{11} - L_P(X_1, \ldots, X_k)$ is invertible in $M_m(\mathcal{R})$ (m being the size of the matrix L_P). Moreover, the construction above guarantees that the matrix Q

in the linearization $L_P(X_1, \ldots, X_k) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u \\ v & Q \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible independently of the elements $X_1, \ldots, X_k \in \mathcal{R}$. We apply this to the case when $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is a unital C*-algebra of bounded linear operators on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, for various separable Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}$. We formalize this result in the following

Lemma 6.1. *Let $P = P^* \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$ and let $L_P \in M_m(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$ be a linearization of P with the properties outlined above. Let $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ be a k-tuple of self-adjoint operators in a $\mathcal{C}^*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$. Then, for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $z\hat{E}_{11} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - L_P(y)$ is invertible if and only if $z1_{\mathcal{A}} - P(y)$ is invertible.*

Beyond the property described above, we want also to compare the norms of the inverses of $z\hat{E}_{11} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - L_P(y)$ and $z1_{\mathcal{A}} - P(y)$ when one (and hence the other) exists.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $P = P^* \in \mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle$ and let $L_P \in M_m(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_k\rangle)$ be a linearization of P constructed as above. Let $y_n = (y_1^{(n)}, \ldots, y_k^{(n)})$ be a k-tuple of self-adjoint operators in a $\mathcal{C}^*$-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\sup_n \max_{i=1}^k \|y_n^{(i)}\| = C < +\infty$. Let $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that, for all large n, the distance from z_0 to $sp(P(y_n))$ is greater than δ. Then, there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$, depending only on δ, L_P and C such that the distance from 0 to $sp(z_0\hat{E}_{11} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - L_P(y_n))$ is at least ϵ.*

Proof. In this proof we only consider P, u and Q evaluated in y_n, so we will suppress y_n from the notation without any risk of confusion. Let $L_P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & u^* \\ u & Q \end{bmatrix}$, so that $z_0\hat{E}_{11} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - L_P = \begin{bmatrix} z_0 & -u^* \\ -u & -Q \end{bmatrix}$, as above. We seek an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $z_0\hat{E}_{11} \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - L_P - z(I_m \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}) = \begin{bmatrix} z_0 - z & -u^* \\ -u & -Q - z \end{bmatrix}$ is invertible for all $|z| < \epsilon$. We naturally require first that $-Q - z$ remains invertible. As $Q = Q^*$, it follows by functional calculus that the spectrum of $-Q$ is at distance equal to $\|Q^{-1}\|^{-1}$ from zero. As noted before, $Q^{-1} \in M_{m-1}(\mathbb{C}\langle y_1^{(n)}, \ldots, y_k^{(n)}\rangle)$, with entries depending only on P, so that we can majorize $\|Q^{-1}\|$ by a constant $\kappa > 0$ depending only on C and L_P (and independent of the particular y_n). Thus, our first condition on ϵ is $\epsilon \leq \kappa^{-1}/2$. Note that it follows that $\|(Q + z)^{-1}\| < 2\kappa$. Next, we require that in addition $(z_0 - z - u^*(-Q - z)^{-1}u)$ is invertible for all $|z| < \epsilon$. By the openness of the resolvent set, we do know that such an $\epsilon > 0$ exists. More precisely, by a geometric series argument, if a is invertible, then $b = ((b - a)a^{-1} + 1)a$ is invertible whenever $\|b - a\| < \|a^{-1}\|^{-1}$. We apply this to $a = z_0 - P = z_0 + u^*Q^{-1}u$ (so that $\|a^{-1}\|^{-1} > \delta$) and

$b = z_0 - z - u^*(-Q-z)^{-1}u$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\|z_0 + u^*Q^{-1}u - z_0 + z + u^*(-Q-z)^{-1}u\| & \\ \leq & |z| + \|u^*[(-Q-z)^{-1} + Q^{-1}]u\| \\ \leq & |z| + |z|\|u\|^2\|Q^{-1}\|\|(Q+z)^{-1}\| \\ \leq & |z|(1+2\kappa^2\|u\|^2).\end{aligned}$$

Since the norm of u is majorized in terms of C and L_P only by some constant $\ell > 0$, we deduce that $\|z_0 + u^*Q^{-1}u - z_0 + z + u^*(-Q-z)^{-1}u\| \leq |z|(1 + 2\kappa^2\ell^2)$. Thus, we require $|z|(1+2\kappa^2\ell^2) < \delta$. This yields that , if $|z| < \min\{\kappa^{-1}/2, \frac{\delta}{(1+2\kappa^2\ell^2)}\}$, then $z_0\hat{E}_{11}\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - L_P - z(I_m \otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}})$ is invertible. This concludes the proof of our lemma. □

6.2 From Lemma 1.3 to Theorem 1.1

Let $a_n = (a_n^{(1)}, \ldots, a_n^{(t)})$ be a t-tuple of noncommutative self-adjoint random variables which is free with the semicircular system $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$, such that the distribution of a_n in $(\mathcal{A}, \tau)$ coincides with the distribution of $(A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)})$ in $(M_n(\mathbb{C}), \mathrm{tr}_n)$. Let P be a Hermitian polynomial in t+r noncommutative indeterminates. Let $L_P \in M_m(\mathbb{C}\langle X_1, \ldots, X_{t+r}\rangle)$ be a linearization of P as constructed in Section 6.1. Fix $\delta > 0$ and let $z \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that for all large n, the distance from z to the spectrum of $\left(P\left(x_1, \ldots, x_r, a_n^{(1)}, \ldots, a_n^{(t)}\right)\right)$ is greater than δ. According to Lemma 6.2 (and (1.4)), there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$, depending only on δ, L_P and $\sup_n \max_{1\leq u\leq t}\|A_n^{(u)}\|$ such that the distance from 0 to $sp(z\hat{E}_{11}\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}} - L_P(x_1, \ldots, x_r, a_n^{(1)}, \ldots, a_n^{(t)}))$ is as least ϵ. Now, according to Lemma 1.3, almost surely, for all large n, the distance from 0 to the spectrum of $(z\hat{E}_{11}\otimes I_n - L_P(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}}, A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)}))$ is as least $\epsilon/2$. Hence, for any $z' \in]z-\epsilon/4; z+\epsilon/4[$, 0 is not in the spectrum of $(z'\hat{E}_{11}\otimes I_n - L_P(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}}, A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)}))$. Finally, according to Lemma 6.1, almost surely, for large n, $]z-\epsilon/4; z+\epsilon/4[$ lies outside the spectrum of $P(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}}, A_n^{(1)}, \ldots, A_n^{(t)})$. A compacity argument readily yields Theorem 1.1.

7 Proof of (1.11)

Our approach is then very similar to that of [20] and [29]. Therefore, we will recall the main steps.
First, the almost sure minoration

$$\liminf_{n\longrightarrow+\infty}\left\|P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}},\ldots,\frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}},A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)}\right)\right\|\geq\|P(x_1,\ldots x_r,a_1,\ldots,a_t)\|$$

comes rather easily from (1.6); this can be proved by closely following the proof of Lemma 7.2 in [20]. So, the main difficulty is the proof of the almost sure reverse inequality:

$$\limsup_{n\longrightarrow+\infty}\left\|P\left(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}},\ldots,\frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}},,A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)}\right)\right\|\leq\|P(x_1,\ldots x_r,,a_1,\ldots,a_t)\|_{\mathcal{A}} \tag{7.1}$$

The proof of (7.1) consists in two steps.

Step 1: A linearization trick (see Section 2 and the proof of Proposition 7.3 in [20])
In order to prove (7.1), it is sufficient to prove:

Lemma 7.1. *For all $m\in\mathbb{N}$, all self-adjoint matrices $\gamma,\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_r,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_t$ of size $m\times m$ and all $\epsilon>0$, almost surely for all large n,*

$$sp(\gamma\otimes I_n+\sum_{v=1}^{r}\alpha_v\otimes\frac{X_n^{(v)}}{\sqrt{n}}+\sum_{u=1}^{t}\beta_u\otimes A_n^{(u)})$$

$$\subset sp(\gamma\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}+\sum_{v=1}^{r}\alpha_v\otimes x_v+\sum_{u=1}^{t}\beta_u\otimes a_u)+]-\epsilon,\epsilon[. \tag{7.2}$$

Step 2: An intermediate inclusion Let $a_n=(a_n^{(1)},\ldots,a_n^{(t)})$ be a t-tuple of noncommutative self-adjoint random variables which is free with the semi-circular system $x=(x_1,\ldots,x_r)$ in $(\mathcal{A},\tau)$, such that the distribution of a_n coincides with the distribution of $(A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)})$ in $(M_n(\mathbb{C}),\mathrm{tr}_n)$. Male [25] proved that if $(A_n^{(1)},\ldots,A_n^{(t)})$ converges strongly to $(a_1,\ldots,a_t)$, then, for any $\epsilon>0$, for all large n,

$$sp(\gamma\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}+\textstyle\sum_{v=1}^{r}\alpha_v\otimes x_v+\sum_{u=1}^{t}\beta_u\otimes a_n^{(u)})$$

$$\subset sp(\gamma\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}+\sum_{v=1}^{r}\alpha_v\otimes x_i+\sum_{u=1}^{t}\beta_u\otimes a_u)+]-\epsilon,\epsilon[. \tag{7.3}$$

Therefore, Lemma 7.1 can be deduced from Lemma 1.3.

8 Appendix

8.1 Basic identities and inequalities

Lemma 8.1. *For any matrix $M \in M_m(\mathbb{C}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$,*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k,l=1}^{n} ||M_{kl}||^2 \leq m||M||^2 \tag{8.1}$$

and for any fixed k,

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n} ||M_{lk}||^2 \leq m||M||^2 \tag{8.2}$$

and

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n} ||M_{kl}||^2 \leq m||M||^2. \tag{8.3}$$

Proof.

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k,l=1}^{n} ||M_{kl}||^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k,l=1}^{n} ||M_{kl}||_2^2 = m \operatorname{tr}_{mn} MM^* \leq m\|MM^*\| \leq m\|M\|^2.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l=1}^{n} ||M_{lk}||^2 &\leq \sum_{l=1}^{n} ||M_{lk}||_2^2 \\ &= \operatorname{Tr} M(I_m \otimes E_{kk})M^* \\ &= \operatorname{Tr}(I_m \otimes E_{kk})M^*M(I_m \otimes E_{kk}) \\ &\leq \|M\|^2 \operatorname{Tr}(I_m \otimes E_{kk}) = m\|M\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n} ||M_{kl}||^2 = \sum_{l=1}^{n} ||M_{kl}^*||^2 = \sum_{l=1}^{n} ||(M^*)_{lk}||^2 \leq m\|M^*\| = m\|M\|.$$

□

We end by recalling some properties of resolvents. First, one can easily see that for any λ and $\lambda^{'}$ in $M_m(C)$ such that $Im(\lambda)$ and $Im(\lambda^{'})$ are positive definite,

$$(\lambda\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}-s)^{-1}-(\lambda^{'}\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}-s)^{-1}=(\lambda\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}-s)^{-1}(\lambda^{'}-\lambda)(\lambda^{'}\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}-s)^{-1}. \quad (8.4)$$

For a Hermitian matrix M, the derivative w.r.t M of the resolvent $R(z)=(z-M)^{-1}$ satisfies:

$$R'_M(z).H=R(z)HR(z) \text{ for all Hermitian matrix } H. \quad (8.5)$$

Lemma 8.2. *Let λ in $M_m(C)$ such that $Im(\lambda)$ is positive definite and h be a self-adjoint element in $M_m(\mathbb{C})\otimes\mathcal{A}$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is a C^*-algebra endowed with some state τ. Then*

$$\|(\lambda\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}-h)^{-1}\|\leq||Im(\lambda)^{-1}\| \quad and \quad ||G(\lambda)||\leq||Im(\lambda)^{-1}||, \quad (8.6)$$

where $G(\lambda)=(\mathrm{id}_m\otimes\tau)[(\lambda\otimes 1_{\mathcal{A}}-h)^{-1}]$.

Lemma 8.3. *Let λ in $M_m(C)$ such that $Im(\lambda)$ is positive definite, then for any $mn\times mn$ Hermitian matrix H*

$$||(\lambda\otimes I_n-H)^{-1}||\leq||Im(\lambda)^{-1}||, \quad (8.7)$$

$$\forall 1\leq k,l\leq n, ||(\lambda\otimes I_n-H)^{-1}_{kl}||\leq||Im(\lambda)^{-1}||,$$

and for $p\geq 2$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k,l=1}^{n}||(\lambda\otimes I_n-H)^{-1}_{kl}||^p\leq m||Im(\lambda)^{-1}||^p. \quad (8.8)$$

8.2 Variance estimates

We refer the reader to the book [4]. A probability measure μ on $\mathbb{R}$ is said to satisfy the Poincaré inequality with constant C_{PI} if for any $\mathcal{C}^1$ function $f:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{C}$ such that f and f' are in $L^2(\mu)$,

$$\mathbf{V}(f)\leq C_{PI}\int|f'|^2d\mu,$$

with $\mathbf{V}(f)=\int|f-\int fd\mu|^2d\mu$.

Remark 5. *If the law of a random variable X satisfies the Poincaré inequality with constant C_{PI} then, for any fixed $\alpha \neq 0$, the law of αX satisfies the Poincaré inequality with constant $\alpha^2 C_{PI}$.*
Assume that probability measures $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_M$ on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfy the Poincaré inequality with constant $C_{PI}(1), \ldots, C_{PI}(M)$ respectively. Then the product measure $\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_M$ on $\mathbb{R}^M$ satisfies the Poincaré inequality with constant $C^*_{PI} = \max_{i \in \{1,\ldots,M\}} C_{PI}(i)$ in the sense that for any differentiable function f such that f and its gradient $\mathrm{grad} f$ are in $L^2(\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_M)$,

$$\mathbf{V}(f) \leq C^*_{PI} \int \|\mathrm{grad} f\|_2^2 d\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_M$$

with $\mathbf{V}(f) = \int |f - \int f d\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_M|^2 d\mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_M$ (see Theorem 2.5 in [19]) .

Lemma 8.4. *[Theorem 1.2 in [10]] Assume that the distribution of a random variable X is supported in $[-C; C]$ for some constant $C > 1$. Let g be an independent standard real Gaussian random variable. Then $X + \delta g$ satisfies a Poincaré inequality with constant $C_{PI} \leq \delta^2 \exp\left(4C^2/\delta^2\right)$.*

Consider the linear isomorphism Ψ_0 between $M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ defined for any $[b_{kl}]_{k,l=1}^n \in M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa}$ by

$$\Psi_0([b_{kl}]_{k,l=1}^n) = ((b_{kk})_{1 \leq k \leq n}, (\sqrt{2}\Re e(b_{kl}))_{1 \leq k < l \leq n}, (\sqrt{2}\Im m(b_{kl}))_{1 \leq k < l \leq n}).$$

Denote by Ψ the natural extension of Ψ_0 to a linear isomorphism between $(M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa})^r$ and $\mathbb{R}^{rn^2}$ defined for any $(B_1, \ldots, B_r)$ in $(M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa})^r$ by

$$\Psi(B_1, \ldots, B_r) = (\Psi_0(B_1), \ldots, \Psi_0(B_r)).$$

Lemma 8.5. *Consider r independent $n \times n$ random Hermitian matrices $X_n^{(v)} = [X_{jk}^{(v)}]_{j,k=1}^n$, $v = 1, \ldots, r$, such that the random variables $X_{ii}^{(v)}$, $\sqrt{2}Re(X_{ij}^{(v)})$, $\sqrt{2}Im(X_{ij}^{(v)}), i < j$, are independent and satisfies a Poincaré inequality with common constant C_{PI}. Let $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R}^{rn^2} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a $\mathcal{C}^1$ function such that $\tilde{f}$ and $\mathrm{grad}\tilde{f}$ are bounded. Consider the $\mathcal{C}^1$ function $f : (M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa})^r \to \mathbb{C}$ given by $f = \tilde{f} \circ \Psi$. Then*

$$\mathbf{V} f(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}}) \leq \frac{C_{PI}}{n} \mathbb{E}\{\|\mathrm{grad} f(\frac{X_n^{(1)}}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{X_n^{(r)}}{\sqrt{n}})\|_e^2\} \tag{8.9}$$

where for any Hermitian matrices $Z_1, \ldots, Z_r, W_1, \ldots, W_r$,

$$\langle (Z_1, \ldots, Z_r), (W_1, \ldots, W_r) \rangle_e = \sum_{v=1}^r \mathrm{Tr}(Z_v W_v).$$

Proof. (8.9) follows from Remark 5, using that Ψ is a linear isometry from $((M_n(\mathbb{C})_{sa})^r, \langle , \rangle_e)$ to $\mathbb{R}^{rn^2}$ with usual Euclidean inner product. □

References

[1] N. Akhiezer. The Classical Moment Problem. Hafner, New York, 1965.

[2] G.W. Anderson. Convergence of the largest singular value of a polynomial in independent Wigner matrices. *Ann. Probab.* 41, no. 3B (2013), 2103-2181.

[3] G. Anderson, A. Guionnet, and O. Zeitouni. *An Introduction to Random Matrices*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[4] C. Ané, S. Blachère, D. Chafaï, P. Fougères, I. Gentil, F. Malrieu F, C. Roberto, G. Scheffer. *Sur les inégalités de Sobolev logarithmiques* (French) [Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities], Panoramas et Synthèses [Panoramas and Syntheses] **10**, S.M.F Paris, 2000.

[5] M. Anshelevich, S.T. Belinschi, M Février, and A. Nica. Convolution powers in the operator-valued framework. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **365**, no. 4 (2013), 2063–2097.

[6] Z. Bai and J. Silverstein. No eigenvalues outside the support of the limiting spectral distribution of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices. *Ann. Probab.* 26 , no. 1 (1998), 316–345.

[7] Z. D. Bai and J. W. Silverstein. Spectral Analysis of of large-dimensional random matrices. Mathematics Monograph Series 2, Science Press Beijing 2006.

[8] Z. Bai and J. Silverstein. No eigenvalues outside the support of the limiting spectral distribution of information-plus-noise type matrices. *Random Matrices Theory Appl.* 1, no. 1 (2012), 1150004, 44 pp.

[9] Z. D. Bai, and Y. Q. Yin, Necessary and sufficient conditions for almost sure convergence of the largest eigenvalue of a Wigner matrix. Ann. Probab. 16 (1988), no. 4, 1729-1741.

[10] J.B. Bardet, N. Gozlan, F. Malrieu and P.-A. Zitt. Functional inequalities for Gaussian convolutions of compactly supported measures: explicit bounds and dimension dependence. arXiv:1507.02389 (2015, accepted for publication in the Bernoulli Journal.

[11] S.T. Belinschi. A noncommutative version of the Julia-Wolff-Caratheodory Theorem. arxiv: 1510.05377 (2016).

[12] S. T. Belinschi, T. Mai and R. Speicher, *Analytic subordination theory of operator-valued free additive convolution and the solution of a general random matrix problem.* Journal fur die reine und angewandte Mathematik (2015) DOI 10.1515/crelle-2014-0138

[13] B. Blackadar, Operator Algebras. Theory of C*-Algebras and von Neumann Algebras. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, Volume 122. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2006.

[14] M. Capitaine and C. Donati-Martin. Strong asymptotic freeness for Wigner and Wishart matrices. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 56(2) (2007):767–803.

[15] M. Capitaine, C. Donati-Martin, D. Féral and M. Février. Free convolution with a semicircular distribution and eigenvalues of spiked deformations of Wigner matrices. Electron. J. Probab. 16 no. 64 (2011), 1750–1792.

[16] B. Collins and C. Male. The strong asymptotic freeness of Haar and deterministic matrices, *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.* (4) 47 no. 1 (2014): 147–163.

[17] R. Couillet, Silverstein, J. W., Z. Bai and M. Debbah. Eigen-inference for energy estimation of multiple sources, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 57, 4 (2011):2420–2439.

[18] K. Dykema. On certain free product factors via an extended matrix model. (English summary) *J. Funct. Anal. 112*, no. 1 (1993), 3160.

[19] A. Guionnet and B. Zegarlinski. Lectures on Logarithmic Sobolev inequalities. In *Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXVI*, volume 1801 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*. Springer, Berlin, 2003.

[20] U. Haagerup and S. Thorbjørnsen. A new application of random matrices: $\mathrm{Ext}(C^*_{\mathrm{red}}(F_2))$ is not a group. *Ann. of Math.* (2) (2005), 162(2):711-775.

[21] J. W. Helton, R. Rashidi Far and R. Speicher, *Operator-valued Semicircular Elements: Solving A Quadratic Matrix Equation with Positivity Constraints.* International Mathematics Research Notices, Vol. 2007, Article ID rnm086, 15 pages.

[22] F. Hiai and D. Petz. The semicircle law, free random variables and entropy. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 77. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.

[23] A. M. Khorunzhy, B.A. Khoruzhenko and L.A. Pastur. Asymptotic properties of large random matrices with independent entries. *J. Math. Phys.* 37 no. 10 (1996), 50335060.

[24] M. Ledoux. The Concentration of Measure Phenomenon, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Volume 89, A.M.S, 2001.

[25] C. Male. The norm of polynomials in large random and deterministic matrices. With an appendix by Dimitri Shlyakhtenko. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* 154, no. 3-4 (2012), 477-532.

[26] D. S. Kaliuzhnyi-Verbovetskyi and V. Vinnikov, *Foundations of free noncommutative function theory*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 199. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014.

[27] T. Mai, PhD thesis, Universität des Saarlandes, 2014.

[28] A. Nica, D. Shlyakhtenko, and R. Speicher, *Operator-Valued Distributions. I. Characterizations of Freeness*. International Mathematics Research Notices, **29** (2002), 1509–1538.

[29] H. Schultz. Non-commutative polynomials of independent Gaussian random matrices. The real and symplectic cases. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 131(2)) (2005):261-309.

[30] R. Speicher, *Combinatorial theory of the free product with amalgamation and operator-valued free probability theory*. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 132, no. 627 (1998), pp. x+88.

[31] J.L. Taylor, *Functions of several noncommuting variables*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **79** (1973), 1-34.

[32] S. Thorbjørnsen. Mixed Moments of Voiculescus Gaussian Random Matrices. *J. Funct. Anal.* 176 (2000), 213-246.

[33] H.-G. Tillmann. Randverteilungen analytischer Funktionen und Distributionen. *Math. Z.*, 59 (1953):61-83.

[34] D.V. Voiculescu. Limit laws for random matrices and free products. *Invent. Math.* 104 (1991), 201-220.

[35] D.V. Voiculescu. Operations on certain non-commutative operator-valued random variables. Astérisque (1995), no. 232, 243–275, Recent advances in operator algebras (Orléans, 1992).

[36] D.V. Voiculescu. The coalgebra of the free difference quotient and free probability, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* no. 2 (2000), 79-106.

[37] D.V. Voiculescu, *Analytic subordination consequences of free Markovianity*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **51** (2002), 1161–1166.

[38] Voiculescu, D.V.: Free Analysis Questions I: Duality Transform for the Coalgebra of $\partial_{X:B}$. *Int. Math. Res. Notices* No. 16 (2004), 793–822.

[39] D.V. Voiculescu, K. Dykema, and A. Nica, Free random variables, CRM Monograph Series, vol. 1, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992, ISBN 0-8218-6999-X, A noncommutative probability approach to free products with applications to random matrices, operator algebras and harmonic analysis on free groups.

[40] J. D. Williams. Analytic Function Theory for Operator-Valued Free Probability. Accepted for Publication, Crelles Journal (2013).